



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2001

No. 68

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend F. Kenneth Hoffer, Mount Culmen Evangelical Congregational Church, East Earl, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Ruler of all nations, we give our thanks for Your guidance which has preserved our Nation and for the peaceful continuity of government in America.

We look gratefully to the past, thanking You that from the foundations of America You granted our forefathers courage and wisdom, as they trusted in You. By their example to lead, guide and direct, inspire this Congress whom You have entrusted leadership to serve and wage the struggle to find peace and justice in our world.

For our leaders, diplomats and military, let our resources be a strength to all, regardless of race, creed, faith, age, sex or national origin. May we work together towards justice, righteousness and goodness for all peoples of all nations.

We pray to You, O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOLDEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) for 1 minute. All other 1-minutes will be postponed until the end of the day.

THE REVEREND F. KENNETH HOFFER

(Mr. HOLDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues and Father Coughlin for providing my constituent, Reverend F. Kenneth Hoffer, the opportunity to offer the opening prayer this morning in the House Chamber.

Pastor Hoffer resides in Reading, Pennsylvania, and is the pastor at the Mount Culmen Evangelical Congregational Church in East Earl, Pennsylvania. He was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and graduated from Manheim Central High School.

Mr. Speaker, he served with distinction in the United States Navy during World War II. He graduated from Lebanon Valley College in 1953 and went

on to study theology at the Evangelical School of Theology in Myers-town, Pennsylvania.

He and his wife Anna have been married for 48 years and are the proud parents of a son, Craig, and three grandchildren.

On behalf of all of my colleagues, I would like to thank Reverend Hoffer for his spiritual guidance this morning.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 68, answered "present" 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]
YEAS—336

Abercrombie	Barton	Bonilla
Ackerman	Bass	Bono
Akin	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Bentsen	Boyd
Andrews	Bereuter	Brady (TX)
Armey	Berkley	Brown (OH)
Baca	Berman	Brown (SC)
Bachus	Berry	Bryant
Baker	Biggert	Burr
Baldacci	Bilirakis	Burton
Baldwin	Bishop	Buyer
Ballenger	Blagojevich	Callahan
Barcia	Blumenauer	Calvert
Barr	Blunt	Camp
Barrett	Boehrlert	Cannon
Bartlett	Boehner	Cantor

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2283

Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer

Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-Gekas
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts

Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—68

Aderholt
Baird
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Condit
Costello
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
DeFazio
DeLauro
Evans
Filner
Frost
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holt

Hutchinson
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Lee
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Menendez
Miller, George
Moore
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone

Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Ramstad
Rothman
Sabo
Sanchez
Schaffer
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Waters
Wu

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—26

Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Cubin
Doyle
English
Ganske
Gilman
Gordon

Hayworth
Herger
Hunter
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Kilpatrick
Klecza
Leach
Lucas (OK)

McKinney
Moakley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Sanders
Weller
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1027

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 122 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the unofficial results received from Dick Filling, Commissioner, Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, indicating that, according to the unofficial results of the Special Election held on May 15, 2001, the Honorable Bill Shuster was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress, from the Ninth Congressional District, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, Clerk.

Attachment.

SPECIAL ELECTION, REPRESENTATIVE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS, 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, COUNTIES OF BEDFORD, BLAIR, CENTRE, CLEARFIELD, FRANKLIN, FULTON, HUNTINGDON, JUNIATA, MIFFLIN, PERRY AND SNYDER, MAY 15, 2001

Unofficial Results

Republican—Bill Shuster	Vote Totals	55,549
Democratic—H. Scott Conklin		47,049
Green—Alanna K. Hartzok		4,420

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE BILL SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BILL SHUSTER) be permitted to take the oath of office today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the Members of the Pennsylvania delegation present themselves in the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. SHUSTER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solely swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you will take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 107th Congress of the United States.

□ 1030

INTRODUCTION OF BILL SHUSTER, NEW MEMBER FROM PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and extreme privilege to introduce the newest Member of the House to its Members here. He succeeds an individual who has become anonymous and who is little known in this Chamber but, despite that, we will present him with the distinction that he carries a name that has been a part of our traditions for many, many years. He is, of course, the son of Bud Shuster.

Beyond that, he, as an individual, was elected in the heart of Pennsylvania, was born and raised in that area, in Hollidaysburg, where he went to school and became a star athlete in three varsity sports, and who then went to Dickinson College. And by the way, what that does is double the number of Dickinson College graduates of this body in the Dickinson College Caucus, which I chair. Then he went and received a master's degree from American University. All the way up, he worked as a farm laborer, as a construction worker, in various businesses, until, at the time of his election, he was an entrepreneur in the automobile business.

His two children, who are with him, Ali, age 13, and Garrett, who is nine,

are with him, as is the mother of the children, Rebecca, and a whole host of Shuster family and supporters. He is ready to tackle the job. He has talked about nothing except his future service in the House of Representatives. He is eager to take his place among us. We are ready to hear him and to help him and to help him become a great Member of the House of Representatives. BILL SHUSTER.

READY TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE OF THE NINTH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much for the introduction.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to stand here today as the newest Representative from the Ninth District from Pennsylvania. I want to thank the voters of central Pennsylvania for this incredible privilege. The faith and trust the people of Pennsylvania have placed in me is indeed an awesome responsibility.

Over the past 4½ months, I have traveled throughout the 11 counties that make up the ninth district, from DuBois to Chambersburg. I have listened closely to the concerns of the people: teachers, factory workers, senior citizens, business owners, young people and farmers. And I come here today ready to represent their values and bring their voices and concerns to Washington.

Job creation, tax relief for our families and businesses, strengthening and securing Social Security and Medicare for this generation and the next are among my top priorities. I am particularly honored to be sworn in today and cast my first vote for H.R. 1, the President's education plan. As the father of two young children in public schools and the husband of a schoolteacher, I can tell my colleagues that reforming and improving our education system is one of the most important areas that Congress can act on.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the days and months ahead working with my colleagues, and especially those in the Pennsylvania delegation, in accomplishing the people's business.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends, many of whom have traveled down here to be with me today. Without their continued love and support, I would not be here. I would especially like to thank my mother, Pat; and my father, Bud; my wife, Becky; and my two children, Ali and Garrett. Again, none of this would be possible without their love and support.

HOPE FOR CHILDREN ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 141 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 141

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 141 makes in order the bill H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

While this is a closed rule, it is important for my colleagues to understand that this bill represents a bipartisan effort that has the support of 289 Members of this body and could be passed under suspension. However, this rule will provide extra time for my colleagues to debate and discuss the importance of the adoption tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, adoption is an issue that holds a special place in my heart. It blesses a loving couple with the joy of parenthood and provides wanting children the chance to find permanency in their lives and love in their hearts. As an adoptive parent, I know firsthand this joy, but I also understand the financial burdens that it places on a family. Tragically, this burden can be so high that it prevents a couple from becoming a family and sadly leaves a needing child without a home.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the legislation that created this tax credit 5 years ago, and an original cosponsor of this, the Hope for Children Act, I am proud to be here today discussing these important changes that serve to update the adoption credit. Since the passage of the original credit 5 years ago, Congress has been working hard to strengthen adoption laws in the United States.

In the 1996 legislation, we included a provision that prohibited discrimina-

tion in adoption or foster care placements, helping to assure that the cultural, ethnic or racial background of a child would not hinder the placement into a loving home. Then, in 1997, Congress passed one of the most important child welfare laws in 20 years, the Adoption and Safe Families Act. This legislation helped to ensure that consideration of a child's safety is paramount in placement decisions.

June of 2000 saw the introduction of the adoption stamp, which many in Congress supported as a way to bring awareness to the 122,000 children waiting to be adopted in this country alone. In October of 2000, with passage of the Intercountry Adoption Act, the United States became the 39th country to ratify the Hague Convention, a cooperative framework between countries which ensures that a child's best interests are safeguarded during intercountry adoption processes.

That same month, Congress passed the Child Citizenship Act, a bill that grants automatic citizenship to foreign-born children adopted by American parents. And then came the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts, which bolsters the efficiency and effectiveness of courts so that children in our child welfare system are not kept from permanent homes due to delays in the court system.

Now, in 2001, this House will consider the Hope for Children Act, legislation designed to help foster and facilitate adoptions; legislation that will strengthen families across the Nation; and legislation that will help to provide loving homes to children who desperately need them.

Current law provides a \$5,000 tax credit to families for qualifying adoption expenses when adopting a child and \$6,000 for a child with special needs. This is set to expire. Over 289 Members of the House have cosponsored the Hope for Children Act to show their support for extending and updating these sections of the code. H.R. 622 would begin by making the current tax credits a permanent part of the Tax Code. It would also raise the credit limitations to better reflect the costs of adoptions, allowing families to claim up to \$10,000 in qualifying expenses upon adoption.

Statistics from the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse show that the cost of adoptions range from \$4,000 on the low end to sometimes over \$30,000 on the high end, depending on such factors as the cost of birth-parent counseling, adoptive-parent home study and preparation, the child's birth expenses and post-placement supervision until the adoption is finalized. This bill will update the credit to better reflect the costs associated with adoption today. This increase will provide an additional \$4,000 to the tax credit for special needs adoptions.

Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of the children waiting in foster care are between

the ages of 6 and 18. With this increased age comes an increased likelihood that these children will be classified by the State as special-needs children due to histories of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. We have children waiting to be adopted that bring with them physical handicaps, and entire sibling groups that need to be placed in a home together. These children, more than any others, need a loving, permanent home; and families that will open their hearts should be given the utmost support. All of these important changes will be available to families beginning with expenses incurred in the 2002 tax year.

Mr. Speaker, we have to reduce the financial burden that adoption can place on families so that couples can become families and more children can sleep peacefully under the roof of loving parents. The Hope for Children Act will continue the hard work and dedication this Congress has devoted to adoption by reducing this huge financial barrier. It will help more children find the love of a family.

I urge all my colleagues to support both the rule and this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a closed rule. It will allow for the consideration of the bill called the Hope for Children Act, H.R. 622. As my colleague from Ohio has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1045

Under the rule, no amendments are in order.

Mr. Speaker, this bill permanently extends the adoption tax credit. It raises it to \$10,000. The bill also permanently extends the exclusion from income for employer-provided adoption assistance and raises it to \$10,000. Under current law the amount in both provisions is \$6,000 for special-needs children and \$5,000 for other children.

Special-needs children include those who have physical, mental or emotional handicaps that make difficult placing the child with adoptive parents.

Mr. Speaker, permanently placing foster children with loving, adoptive parents is an important goal for our society. In doing so, we are setting a firm foundation in life for these children and strengthening our society as a whole. Therefore, it is appropriate for our government, including the Federal Tax Code, to encourage adoptions.

I am proud to join the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and close to 200 of my House colleagues as a cosponsor of the bill. Almost two-thirds of the

House has cosponsored this legislation. I regret that this is a closed rule which will not permit any amendments. Even in the case of tax bills, it is often customary to permit one substitute amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us does not offer sufficient incentives to promote the adoption of special-needs children; and although the bill does increase the size of the adoption tax credit, the definition of qualified adoption expenses is inadequate to help the overwhelming majority of families adopting special-needs children. Because this is a closed rule, there will be no opportunity to improve this on the House floor.

It is the understanding of concerned Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means that this issue will be addressed later in the legislative process. I am concerned about this closed rule. However, the bill was approved by the Committee on Ways and Means with Democratic support. The bill clearly has the overwhelming support of House Members on both sides of the aisle; therefore, I support the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), an adoptive father himself.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule. I do not like closed rules myself, but I think in this case with the bipartisan support that we have on the bill, I doubt if there will be very many people opposed to it. I support the rule and am a cosponsor of the bill.

I have a son. He happens to be adopted. I would like to tell people that there is no difference between a natural son and an adopted son as far as the love and care, through better and worse. Like all children, you have problems; but it has been a blessing to my wife and myself.

I would also tell you a story. My brother, when he was going to college, was dating a young lady. Unbeknownst to him, the young lady became pregnant. She went away to Kansas City and gave birth to this child without my brother's knowledge.

Later on, my brother married this same young lady. They had two children. Later on, the adopted child wanted to know who her parents were. My niece, Louise, sought to find her mother. It took almost 2 years. She arrived in St. Louis and called my sister-in-law and said, "I think you are my mother." Louise had been adopted. She turned out to be living about a mile away from her natural parents.

When she arrived, she had no idea she had a natural father and a natural brother and sister. Louise is now pregnant with her third child. No, the child will not be aborted; and the child will have a loving family from Josh and Louise. A loving mother who supported her daughter's right to seek her nat-

ural parents is very close to my brother and the entire family.

So the story, Mr. Speaker, is that adopted children, there are success stories. And it is a wonderful thing that I think Members on both sides of the aisle are doing here by making it possible to go forward with this bill. Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsors of this bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill. I was among its original cosponsors, and I want to take a moment to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for their leadership.

The bill will make it possible for many more families to provide children with loving and permanent homes. But I would be remiss not to acknowledge my disappointment that the bill we are considering today is not the one that I cosponsored originally. It has been stripped of one of its most important provisions which was designed to help those adoptive families most in need of our assistance, those who adopt children with special needs.

Children with special needs are those who, because of their age, race, disability or other characteristics, would be unlikely to find a permanent home without special assistance. Many are older, some have mental or physical or emotional problems. Not only are these children the least likely to find a loving home, but when they do find a home, their adoptive parents typically face financial burdens in caring for them.

There are some 125,000, approximately, children in foster care now who are eligible for adoption and who continue to wait and wait and wait for a permanent placement. The vast majority of these children are so-called children with special needs.

The credit actually does little for these families, unfortunately, because it can be applied to only such adoption-related expenses as adoption fees, court costs and attorneys' fees. Most special-needs children are adopted from foster care and publicly-supported institutions, and the families who do adopt them do not incur these kinds of expenses. That is why the Department of Treasury reported last October that only 15 percent of these families were able to claim any tax benefits under the credit for 1998.

The provision that was removed from the bill would have remedied this situation by providing a \$10,000 tax credit for families who adopt special-needs children irrespective of the nature of the expenses they incur in providing for the child.

Mr. Speaker, this would have ensured that all adoptive parents could partake equally in the benefits of the credit. Most importantly, it would have provided a meaningful incentive to those

who are eager to adopt children with special needs but maybe are unable to absorb all of the extraordinary financial burdens that this can entail.

As an adoptive father myself, I believe we have a strong interest as a society, as a Nation, in encouraging all adoptions, but especially those that provide a permanent home to a child with special needs.

As I indicated, I am going to support the bill, but I hope very much that a way can be found to reinstate the provision before it is sent to the President for his signature.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, regret that the provision that the gentleman spoke of is not included. However, we have assurances from our Committee on Ways and Means that this matter will be subject to hearings. I think there is great support for it in the Senate. I, too, hope it is added before it goes to the President for signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a champion of the issue of adoption in the House of Representatives.

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and for her leadership on the issue of adoption.

Mr. Speaker, since 1995, we have made tremendous progress from the creation of the credit, to ending discrimination in adoption, to the Adoption in Safe Families Act, a stamp commemorating adoption, the Inter-country Adoption Act to help people who are adopting children from abroad, and the Child Citizenship Act to make sure that children who are foreign born who are adopted by American parents receive automatic citizenship. That had been a real hang-up for families who are adopting. And also for the Abuse and Neglect Act; and now, of course, today increasing the credit.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. This bill represents a unanimous bipartisan effort from the Committee on Ways and Means and from the House. There are well over 289 cosponsors, a significant amount of support.

This rule will provide extra time for my colleagues to debate and discuss the importance of this act. The credit, as I said, was originally enacted in the mid-1990s. A portion of that original law is set to expire. So if we do not act, we will lose the adoption credit, and we need to update the language of this bill to better reflect the realities and cost of adoption today.

The Hope for Children Act will make permanent an update of the adoption tax credit, increasing the credit to \$10,000 per eligible child and raising the income caps and exempting the credit from the Alternative Minimum Tax, so

there are no adverse tax consequences for people who use this credit.

It will also extend the gross income exclusion for employer-provided adoption assistance programs and raise that maximum exclusion to \$10,000 as well.

As has been stated, this is about children and families and about finding a loving home for children who do not have homes. That is the most important thing in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, again I wanted to commend the leadership on the bipartisan effort of this bill, and especially the leadership of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) who has brought the issue of adoption to the floor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and also the rule, and for the very strong pro-family, pro-adoption tax relief policy, Hope for Children Act. Children's issues, and specifically promoting adoption and improving foster care, have been important legislative goals in my career. I am proud to have worked with President Clinton and his staff in a bipartisan way in this Congress back in 1996 when we passed the original bill that helped break down the financial and bureaucratic barriers to adoption, giving every child what every child needs and deserves: loving parents and a strong, stable home.

This legislation eases the cost of adoption by increasing the adoption tax credit that expired this year from \$5,000 to \$10,000 for all adoptions, and increases the employer adoption assistance exclusion to \$10,000.

Every child deserves a loving family. This legislation helps provide assistance to those families who wish to add a child to their lives. All parents today face the stark reality that raising children, although wonderful and a true joy, is also increasingly expensive. The simple cost of going through the adoption process can be very expensive.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this Congress will also be able to address the item that my colleague from Massachusetts raised, the needs of parents who wish to adopt special-needs children. And I am pleased that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), states a commitment from the Committee on Ways and Means to address this later in the session has been forthcoming.

These children are often older and have handicaps and medical conditions, and I urge my colleagues to work with the gentlewoman and others in the future to make sure that this is also included.

Again, I applaud the bipartisan leadership on this bill. With so many children in need of homes, it is morally right for Congress to relieve some of the financial burdens for these families.

All Members of Congress know that our doors are continually beaten down

by those seeking various tax benefits for specific special interests. Children's voices often fail to be heard today in Washington, and I am pleased to stand in support with my colleagues of our Nation's children. This will help thousands of children waiting for a family that wants them, and it will help thousands of middle-class parents adopt them. It is an important bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1100

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and of the Hope for Children Act. I thank my colleagues on the Hope Coalition for their bipartisan leadership on this issue, especially the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few things that can touch a life more than providing a home for a child without a family. The presence of parents in a child's life is undoubtedly the single most important aspect of their development. However, many would-be parents of children without homes are prevented from opening their doors due to the high cost of adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the Hope for Children Act will tear down the financial barriers to adoption by doubling the adoption tax credit from \$5,000 to \$10,000. While this credit may cause a relatively small loss in revenue for the Federal Government, it is a significant step to placing loving families and children together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Hope for Children Act. It is said that He puts the lonely in families. It is the Hope for Children Act that puts the Congress in the business of putting lonely children into the families of America.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I support the rule. This bipartisan legislation addresses the needs of this country's most vulnerable citizens, the children. Many families who would like to open their homes to children in need are prevented from doing so because of the \$8,000 to \$30,000 cost that is associated with this. The increase in the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for all adoptions would greatly facilitate the placement of children into permanent homes.

In Congress, we are limited as to what we can do to promote healthy families. We cannot legislate kindness from parents towards their children nor can we legislate responsible parental behavior. Therefore, it is our duty to do what is in our power to encourage

strong families. One such thing we can do is to enable these families who would like to open their households as permanent and loving homes for children in need. This legislation relieves the heavy financial burden placed on these families.

Any family who wishes to care for these children in a permanent way should have the support of this body. I support the rule and urge passage of the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a good piece of legislation. I think many of us are very proud to be on it. We hope as the bill makes its way through the legislative process that this amendment addressing special-needs children is added. We support the bill and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This issue is very close to my heart and a personal priority. By reducing the financial burden that adoption can place on families, more couples can share their love with lonely, wanting children. That is what it is all about, fulfilling the dreams of those who long for a family.

I would like to give my personal thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the Committee on Ways and Means for their extraordinary efforts on behalf of this bill; the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); and the Adoption Caucus. I urge all my colleagues to support both the rule and this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Bereuter
Ackerman	Baldwin	Berkley
Aderholt	Ballenger	Berman
Akin	Barcia	Berry
Allen	Barr	Biggert
Andrews	Barrett	Bishop
Armey	Bartlett	Blagojevich
Baca	Barton	Blumenauer
Bachus	Bass	Blunt
Baird	Becerra	Boehlert
Baker	Bentsen	Boehner

Bonilla	Goodlatte	Markey
Bonior	Gordon	Mascara
Bono	Goss	Matheson
Boswell	Graham	Matsui
Boucher	Granger	McCarthy (MO)
Boyd	Graves	McCarthy (NY)
Brady (TX)	Green (TX)	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Green (WI)	McCrery
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	McDermott
Brown (SC)	Grucci	McGovern
Bryant	Gutierrez	McHugh
Burr	Gutknecht	McInnis
Burton	Hall (OH)	McIntyre
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Callahan	Hansen	McKinney
Calvert	Harman	McNulty
Camp	Hart	Meehan
Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Capito	Hayes	Menendez
Capps	Hayworth	Mica
Capuano	Hefley	Millender-
Cardin	Herger	McDonald
Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller (FL)
Carson (OK)	Hilleary	Miller, Gary
Castle	Hilliard	Miller, George
Chabot	Hinchee	Mink
Chambliss	Hinojosa	Moakley
Clay	Hobson	Mollohan
Clayton	Hoeffel	Moore
Clement	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Clyburn	Holden	Moran (VA)
Coble	Holt	Morella
Collins	Honda	Murtha
Combest	Hooley	Myrick
Conyers	Horn	Nadler
Costello	Hostettler	Napolitano
Cox	Houghton	Neal
Coyne	Hoyer	Nethercutt
Cramer	Hulshof	Ney
Crane	Hutchinson	Northup
Crenshaw	Hyde	Norwood
Crowley	Inslee	Nussle
Culberson	Isakson	Oberstar
Cummings	Israel	Obey
Cunningham	Issa	Olver
Davis (CA)	Istook	Ortiz
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Osborne
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Ose
Davis, Jo Ann	(TX)	Otter
Davis, Tom	Jefferson	Owens
Deal	Jenkins	Oxley
DeFazio	John	Pallone
DeGette	Johnson (CT)	Pascarell
Delahunt	Johnson (IL)	Pastor
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Payne
DeMint	Jones (NC)	Pelosi
Deutsch	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
Dicks	Kaptur	Petri
Dingell	Keller	Phelps
Doggett	Kelly	Pickering
Dooley	Kennedy (MN)	Pitts
Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Platts
Doyle	Kerns	Pombo
Dreier	Kildee	Pomeroy
Duncan	Kind (WI)	Portman
Dunn	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Edwards	Kingston	Pryce (OH)
Ehlers	Kirk	Putnam
Ehrlich	Kleccka	Quinn
Emerson	Knollenberg	Rahall
Engel	Kolbe	Ramstad
English	Kucinich	Rangel
Eshoo	LaFalce	Regula
Etheridge	LaHood	Rehberg
Evans	Lampson	Reyes
Everett	Langevin	Reynolds
Farr	Lantos	Riley
Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Rivers
Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Finler	Latham	Roemer
Flake	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Fletcher	Leach	Rogers (MI)
Foley	Lee	Rohrabacher
Ford	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Ross
Frank	Lewis (KY)	Rothman
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Roukema
Frost	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Galleghy	LoBiondo	Royce
Gekas	Lofgren	Rush
Gephardt	Lowe	Ryan (WI)
Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Gilchrest	Luther	Sabo
Gillmor	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Goode	Manzullo	Sandlin

Sawyer	Souder	Udall (NM)
Saxton	Spence	Upton
Scarborough	Spratt	Velazquez
Schaffer	Stearns	Visclosky
Schakowsky	Stenholm	Vitter
Schiff	Strickland	Walden
Schrock	Stump	Walsh
Scott	Stupak	Wamp
Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Waters
Serrano	Sweeney	Watkins
Sessions	Tancred	Watt (NC)
Shadegg	Tanner	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Tauscher	Waxman
Shays	Tauzin	Weiner
Sherman	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Sherwood	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Shimkus	Terry	Weller
Shows	Thomas	Wexler
Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Simpson	Thornberry	Wilson
Skeen	Thune	Wolf
Skelton	Thurman	Woolsey
Slaughter	Tiahrt	Wu
Smith (MI)	Tiberi	Wynn
Smith (NJ)	Toomey	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Towns	Young (FL)
Smith (WA)	Trafigant	
Snyder	Turner	
Solis	Udall (CO)	

NAYS—1

Stark

NOT VOTING—16

Bilirakis	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Borski	Gilman	Pence
Brady (PA)	Hunter	Radanovich
Condit	Kilpatrick	Tierney
Cooksey	Largent	
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	

□ 1126

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 141, I call up the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 141, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 622 is as follows:

H.R. 622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hope for Children Act”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF ADOPTION CREDIT AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ADOPTION CREDIT.—Section 23(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of credit) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter—

“(A) in the case of an adoption of a child other than a child with special needs, the amount of the qualified adoption expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer, and

“(B) in the case of an adoption of a child with special needs, \$10,000.”.

(2) ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 137(a) of such Code (relating to adoption assistance programs) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Gross income of an employee does not include amounts paid or expenses incurred by the employer for adoption expenses in connection with the adoption of a child by an employee if such amounts are furnished pursuant to an adoption assistance program. The amount of the exclusion shall be—

“(1) in the case of an adoption of a child other than a child with special needs, the amount of the qualified adoption expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer, and

“(2) in the case of an adoption of a child with special needs, \$10,000.”

(b) DOLLAR LIMITATIONS.—

(1) DOLLAR AMOUNT OF ALLOWED EXPENSES.—

(A) ADOPTION EXPENSES.—Section 23(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of credit) is amended—

(i) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”,

(ii) by striking “(\$6,000, in the case of a child with special needs)”, and

(iii) by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)(A)”.

(B) ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 137(b)(1) of such Code (relating to dollar limitations for adoption assistance programs) is amended—

(i) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”, and

(ii) by striking “(\$6,000, in the case of a child with special needs)”, and

(iii) by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”.

(2) PHASE-OUT LIMITATION.—

(A) ADOPTION EXPENSES.—Clause (i) of section 23(b)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to income limitation) is amended by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(B) ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 137(b)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to income limitation) is amended by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(c) YEAR CREDIT ALLOWED.—Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to year credit allowed) is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“In the case of the adoption of a child with special needs, the credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be allowed for the taxable year in which the adoption becomes final.”

(d) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISIONS.—

(1) CHILDREN WITHOUT SPECIAL NEEDS.—Paragraph (2) of section 23(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to definition of eligible child) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term ‘eligible child’ means any individual who—

“(A) has not attained age 18, or

“(B) is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.”

(2) ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 137 of such Code (relating to adoption assistance programs) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(e) ADJUSTMENT OF DOLLAR AND INCOME LIMITATIONS FOR INFLATION.—

(1) ADOPTION CREDIT.—Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adoption expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2002, each of the dollar amounts in subsection (a)(1)(B) and paragraphs (1) and (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, deter-

mined by substituting ‘calendar year 2001’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.”

(2) ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Section 137 of such Code (relating to adoption assistance programs), as amended by subsection (d), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2002, each of the dollar amounts in subsection (a)(2) and paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (b) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2001’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.”

(f) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 23(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to carryforwards of unused credit) is amended by striking “the limitation imposed” and all that follows through “1400C)” and inserting “the applicable tax limitation”.

(2) APPLICABLE TAX LIMITATION.—Section 23(d) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABLE TAX LIMITATION.—The term ‘applicable tax limitation’ means the sum of—

“(A) the taxpayer’s regular tax liability for the taxable year, reduced (but not below zero) by the sum of the credits allowed by sections 21, 22, 24 (other than the amount of the increase under subsection (d) thereof), 25, and 25A, and

“(B) the tax imposed by section 55 for such taxable year.”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 26(a) of such Code (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended by inserting “(other than section 23)” after “allowed by this subpart”.

(B) Section 53(b)(1) of such Code (relating to minimum tax credit) is amended by inserting “reduced by the aggregate amount taken into account under section 23(d)(3)(B) for all such prior taxable years,” after “1986.”

(g) CREDIT RENAMED THE TOM BLILEY ADOPTION CREDIT.—

(1) The heading of section 23 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 23. TOM BLILEY ADOPTION CREDIT.”

(2) The item relating to section 23 in the table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 23. Tom Bliley adoption credit.”

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of H.R. 622, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hope for Children Act”.

SEC. 2. INCREASED TAX INCENTIVES FOR ADOPTIONS.

(a) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM BENEFIT.—Section 23(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to dollar limitation) is amended by striking “\$5,000” and all that follows and inserting “\$10,000.”

(b) BENEFITS MADE PERMANENT FOR ALL CHILDREN.—Paragraph (2) of section 23(d) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term ‘eligible child’ means any individual who—

“(A) has not attained age 18, or

“(B) is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.”

(c) INCREASE IN PHASEOUT.—Clause (i) of section 23(b)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to income limitation) is amended by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(d) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 23 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than this section) and section 27 for the taxable year.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (c) of section 23 of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 26(a)” and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”, and

(ii) by striking “reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than this section and section 1400C)”.

(B) Paragraph (1) of section 26(a) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than section 23)” after “this subpart”.

(C) Section 904(h) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than section 23)” after “chapter”.

(D) Subsection (d) of section 1400C of such Code is amended by inserting “and section 23” after “this section”.

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO EMPLOYER-PROVIDED ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 137(b) of such Code is amended by striking “\$5,000” and all that follows and inserting “\$10,000.”

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 137(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(3) Section 137 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f) (relating to termination).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

(2) EXPENSES PAID OR INCURRED IN PRIOR YEARS.—Expenses paid or incurred during any taxable year beginning before January 1, 2002, may be taken into account in determining the credit under section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for a taxable year beginning on or after such date only to the extent the aggregate of such expenses does not exceed the applicable limitation under section 23(b)(1) of such Code as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

□ 1130

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before us today is H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act. Most importantly, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for their leadership in moving this

piece of legislation forward. But as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I also want to congratulate Members on both sides of the aisle on the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill before us today is not as the bill was introduced. It was amended in committee to bring together both the idea of the Tax Code assisting in adoption and the President's proposals as outlined during the campaign. This bill may, in fact, be changed as it moves through the legislative process with the Senate; but the heart of the bill, the fundamental purpose of the bill, will not change; that is, that the dollar amounts currently in law, some of them subject to termination, will be made permanent and increased in the hope that adoption will be utilized more frequently in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have a Statement of Administration Policy that I would like inserted in the RECORD. The heart of the Statement of Administration Policy is "H.R. 622 is consistent with the President's priorities, which include permanently extending and increasing the adoption tax credit."

That is the focus that we should place on this bill, and this is one of those opportunities to engage in a discussion and debate on the floor of the House in a way that we do not do it as often as we would like; but joining together on this particular bill, it will be a very rewarding morning.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2001.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY
OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES)

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act, as an important pro-family and pro-adoption tax relief initiative. H.R. 622 is consistent with the President's priorities, which include permanently extending and increasing the adoption tax credit. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress through the legislative process to achieve a result that best embodies the objectives of the President's plan.

Pay-As-You-Go Scoring

Any law that would reduce receipts is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirements of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. Accordingly, H.R. 622 or any substitute amendment in lieu thereof, that will also reduce revenues, will be subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement. The Administration will work with Congress to ensure that any unintended sequester of spending does not occur under current law or the enactment of any other proposals that meet the President's objectives to reduce the debt, fund priority initiatives, and grant tax relief to all income tax paying Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, there is broad support for the underlying goals of H.R. 622, to assist families in meeting their needs on adoption. The bill, as the chairman has indicated, would

increase the adoption credit to \$10,000. That is broadly supported in this body.

Secondly, it would make permanent the adoption credit. In current law, the adoption credit for special-needs children is already permanent, and this bill would make it permanent for all adoptions to use the credit; and there is broad support for that provision.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out two concerns that we have with this bill. As I indicated, we supported the bill, but we have two concerns. First, this is the eighth tax bill that has been considered by this body. This bill is not part of the \$1.25 trillion budget that has passed both this body and the other body. So we are already starting to see additional tax bills that are going to be considered that are going to go beyond the \$1.25 trillion.

One of the concerns that has been expressed by the Democrats is that we, in fact, are going to be having tax relief far in excess of what is provided in the budget resolution. I regret this will probably not be the last time that we will be making this point, that there will be other tax bills that are going to be brought forward that exceed the budget resolution that was passed by this body.

The second concern, and we have already heard this by other speakers speaking on the rule, is that there is not enough help in this legislation for parents who want to adopt special-needs children. The children that fall into this category are our most difficult children to place with adoptive parents. These are usually older children, children that come out of foster care, children that have one or more disabilities. We want to help these children find permanent homes.

Unfortunately, today, only one out of seven parents who adopt a child with special needs can take advantage of the credit that is in the law for adoption expenses; and the main reason for this is that the expenses that qualify for the adoption credit are normally paid for by the social agencies that are involved in adoption of children with special needs. Those parents who can take advantage of the adoption credit find that they do not have as much expenses and they do not reach the limit. The percentage of parents who are using the adoption credit with special-needs children are much lower in reaching the credit than those that are adopting other children. So, therefore, this bill that costs \$2.5 billion over the 10-year window will have little benefit for helping children with special needs find permanent placements.

Mr. Speaker, there are 122,000 children waiting for adoption with special needs. I think we can do more to help families. The original bill had a provision in it that allowed the \$10,000 credit without the documentation of costs. That amendment would cost about \$125 million, a small fraction of the money that the underlying bill that has been reported to this body would cost.

Mr. Speaker, we support this bill; but I would hope that we could do better. I

would like just, if I might, to quote from the Committee Report, and I thank the chairman for including this language in our committee report: "The committee, however, is aware that families adopting special-needs children may incur continuing expenses after the adoption is finalized that are not eligible for these benefits. The committee will continue to search for ways to help alleviate these post-adoption expenses."

I want the chairman to know that we want to work with him in finding a way in which we can provide additional assistance to families who are adopting special-needs children. We think we can do better, and we hope as the bill works its way through the legislative process we will find a way to take care of that need.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, in part to respond to my colleague from Maryland.

In terms of his concerns about finding money to pay for this particular program or, indeed, any other program, because notwithstanding the budget reconciliation numbers, there is included in that budget reconciliation an estimated revenue stream outside of reconciliation of more than \$18 billion over 10 years, more than enough to pay for this particular program, and for a number of others that I would say the Committee on Ways and Means will probably be looking at. These are not large amounts of money, and they can be accommodated.

The question is ordering our priorities; and it seems to me that based upon the support of this bill that this ought to be very high on our priority list to claim its fair share of that revenue outside of reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) be permitted to control the remaining time, someone who has been instrumental in helping us shape this legislation and move it forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for his leadership on this very important issue. This bill would not have come to the floor without his support and effort. Also, I am grateful for the bipartisan effort that this bill has enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to also mention that the former chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BILEY), originally introduced this bill in the last Congress, and along with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE)

and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) helped bring this bill to the floor.

Obviously, I support the Hope for Children Act, H.R. 622, which would raise the tax credit for adoption to \$10,000. Currently the maximum credit is \$6,000 for families who adopt a special-needs child and \$5,000 for all other adoptions. The credit is set to expire this year, and H.R. 622 would make the credit permanent. The special-needs credit, as the gentleman from Maryland mentioned, is permanent now. But furthermore, the Hope for Children Act applies to all adoptions, both domestic and intercountry. As the lead sponsor of the Adoption and Safe Families Act, which was signed into law in November of 1997, I am pleased that we are continuing our efforts to make adoptions easier.

I supported the legislation which was signed into law that provided adoptive parents a \$5,000 per child adoption credit, but now it is time to expand this tax credit and make it permanent. Families can spend anywhere from \$8,000 to \$30,000 to adopt a child; and we need to ease the financial burden that really gets in the way of children finding permanent and loving homes.

I have heard from many families like William and Susan Logan of Midland, Michigan, who would like to open their home to a child, but are prevented or delayed from doing so because of the high cost of adoption. The good news is that the Logans will be traveling abroad in the next couple of weeks to bring home the newest addition to their family.

Regrettably, there are thousands more children who are without permanent families, and it is time we work together to ensure they find a loving home. I believe that now is the time to help those children find the families they are waiting for so that they may enjoy a wonderful, loving relationship. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 622.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time and for being so generous with his time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very nostalgic moment for me. My late wife, Jo, and I started our family with adoption. We brought Ted into our family in April of 1968; and there followed Noelle and Annie and Monica, and now grandchildren, granddaughters. It would not have been possible without adoption.

I started thinking about what we were able to do, how we were able to afford the cost of adoption. But there are many others who could not. And in 1977, I introduced what then was recognized as the very first bill to provide financial assistance for adoption, a modest \$1,500 tax deduction. Well, it was re-

jected by Treasury as costing too much; Treasury could not afford it. There was not really much of a movement across this country for adoption in those days. So I began to work to build a consensus. With the help of Members on both sides of the aisle, it is remarkable how I found support, for example, from our former colleague, Mr. Lightfoot of Iowa, who himself was an adopted child; from Mr. BLILEY, the gentleman from Virginia, who was an adoptive parent. Over time, we built a consensus and a bipartisan momentum until in 1996, 20 years later, legislation was enacted to provide, not a tax deduction, but a much more valuable \$5,000 tax credit. Never in my wildest dreams did I think we could achieve that goal.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT); the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE); the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING); and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), who is currently the floor manager; and the chairman of the committee; and my very, very dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), for championing this cause within the Committee on Ways and Means, and there are many others.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the committee did not follow my suggestion that we name this the Bliley Adoption Tax Credit, but I understand that the Chair has reservations about naming provisions of tax bills for sponsors. However, we do have the Keogh bill; we do have many other provisions of law that are named after former or, at the time, Members of Congress who were their sponsors. Nonetheless, the time will come, when this provision will be known as the Bliley Tax Credit and perhaps just because of his activism. But the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Bliley) and I did join forces in crafting this legislation, securing 289 cosponsors; and I know that he is very pleased. It would be nice if his name were attached to it, but the recognition is there.

Now, I do feel, as the gentleman from Maryland said so well, that this was an opportunity to go farther, to do more.

□ 1145

I feel somewhat ill at ease saying that we should have done more when we already are doing something. But let us never stop. We should never rest in finding homes for children.

A modest number, I think, 122,000 already identified special-needs children will benefit, hopefully, from this legislation with loving parents who will take these children into their homes.

If we want to look at the cost side of it, think of the enormous cost savings to society. The best insurance policy we have against violence in our society, against crime, is a loving family, a home for these children who are not condemned to a life adrift.

But there are further considerations; we do have to think about these: home

and vehicle modifications, out-of-pocket medical expenses, lost income, no reimbursement for such lost income for parents who need to take time to deal with their special needs adoptive child. They are not reimbursed by the State; they are not eligible for the current adoption tax credit.

There is much to be commended in this legislation. It is a big step forward. I am delighted with it. I urge all those parents, all those would-be parents to take a look when this becomes law and move quickly on it, and show that we have acted in good faith and that there is a response, and that children will be taken out of institutions and into loving families.

I will say in closing, that it is not the tax credit by itself that is going to make the difference in whether these children are adopted. Parents will find homes for them. But we should use the Tax Code to make it easier; to show that our government, our tax system, has a heart, and we are opening that heart today a little wider, opening the doors wider to a generous society, a loving society, one that respects life from conception all the way through every stage of human existence.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, it does give me great joy to stand here today to celebrate the thousands of moms, dads, and children who become bigger and stronger families through adoption.

The Hope for Children Act that we will pass in the House today will help build more loving, stable families in America, and send a strong signal across our land that every child is a wanted child.

Like many Americans, I grew up in a family without my father in the home. While my mother and eventually my stepfather did all they could to compensate for this missing piece in my life, nothing could dispel the haunting in my heart that regularly whispered that I was not wanted.

Too many Americans grow up with this sense of not being wanted. But every year in America, thousands of children have an infinitely more positive experience. When a married couple decides to adopt a child, they not only fill a void in their own lives, they send a clear signal to their child that he or she is loved and wanted.

The Hope for Children Act sends a strong signal that America wants her children, all of her children. By helping new parents with the high financial cost of adoption, we as a nation encourage the building of strong, happy families.

I introduced H.R. 622 earlier this year, along with my colleagues in the Hope Coalition, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr.

KING), to work to ensure enactment of the Hope for Children Act this year.

However, as has been mentioned, the original Hope for Children Act to permanently extend and double the tax credit for adoption was introduced in the last Congress by the gentleman from Virginia, our former, our former colleague, Tom Bliley. Chairman Bliley worked tirelessly on adoption issues during his tenure in Congress and paved the way for this legislation.

While he is retired from the House, it is our privilege to carry on his work to pass Hope for Children today. The provisions in this bill are an excellent step in making adoption a reality to more families. As we work with the Senate to help the Hope for Children Act become law, we look forward to exploring the best policy methods to address the unique circumstances of special-needs adoptions in relation to the adoption tax credit.

I want to take a moment to thank my colleagues in the House for showing their overwhelming support for this bill. With 289 cosponsors, this bill is truly bipartisan.

As we celebrate this pro-child, pro-family legislation today, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I also want to thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), for taking a special interest in moving this important legislation.

Lastly, I would like to thank the members of the Hope Coalition and their staffs for working as a team to make the passage of this legislation a reality.

I especially need to thank a member of my staff, Courtney Weise, who has made this her passion for the last 6 months. It is only because of her that we pulled this off today.

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday we celebrated Mother's Day; next month, Father's Day. Being a mom or dad is the greatest privilege in life, and this bill will help make moms and dads all across the country, and make America a better place to live.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, for yielding time to me.

I also want to commend and congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) for introducing this meaningful legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in expressing the importance of the Hope for Children Act. In our country, there are thousands of children without a family to care for them. At the same time, there are thousands of families who would like to bring these children into their homes but cannot because of the rising cost of adoption.

Families today often spend between \$8,000 and \$30,000 just to adopt a child. Yet, the adoption credit to them is only \$5,000. For many families, this makes adoption impossible simply because of the huge financial burden.

Last year, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services consummated 6,281 adoptions. However, this year, DCFS reports that 1,600 children are still waiting to be adopted immediately; and there are 29,000 children in Illinois living in non-permanent substitute homes. By increasing the adoption tax credit to \$10,000, the Hope for Children Act will allow more families to adopt, give them the opportunity to adopt. It will help more children bypass the foster care system and become part of a permanent family. It will also help to encourage the development of more stable families.

Children are indeed the future of our country, and it is necessary that we give them the opportunity to grow up in stable and permanent environments.

So I commend all of those families who would adopt and bring children into their homes. They are indeed what I would call the salt of the Earth, the pillars of the universe: those who are willing to share and give of themselves so that others might have a more meaningful life.

I also want to thank my intern who just joined us, Kate Perdzik, who actually wrote these comments, and the importance of the issue was captured by her, not much more than a child herself, but one who really understands the value of families taking into consideration the needs of others.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act. One of the caseworkers in my district office has adopted five children. The costs of adoptions are exorbitant, often running \$40,000 to \$50,000 per child. Doubling the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 is a positive first step in helping families meet these costs.

Easing the financial burden of adoption makes it possible for more families to give children a loving family and a stable home, something every child deserves.

I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), for this beginning. I am proud to support this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well. Vote aye for H.R. 622.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is fundamental that the family is the central institution of American society. Mr. Speaker, many families open their hearts and open their homes to children through adop-

tion. They know that they can provide a child with a loving home, and they know that they can grow as individuals and as a couple by experiencing the love of a child.

Our enlightened social policy and tax policy should encourage this. Unfortunately, the average adoption in 1998 cost roughly \$5,900, with 25 percent of adoptive parents reporting expenses of more than \$10,000. That price tag prohibits many families from growing, leaving more than 118,000 foster care children waiting to be adopted.

Given the financial commitment being made by families who adopt a child, the current credit does not go far enough. The Hope for Children Act opens the doors for many families who wish to adopt children but find the cost absolutely prohibitive.

H.R. 622 increases the maximum adoption tax credit to \$10,000 from \$6,000 for special-needs children and \$5,000 for all other adoptions, while increasing the income cap for those who claim the credit from \$75,000 to \$150,000. It also makes the credit permanent for all adoptions, not just special-needs children.

The bill allows the credit to apply against the AMT, so families are not unfairly pushed into the AMT by claiming this credit. This plan also increases the exclusion for employer-provided adoption assistance to \$10,000 for all adoptions and makes this provision permanent.

Mr. Speaker, many families in my district and around the United States know firsthand the joy of adopting a child. We should not allow cost to stand as a barrier to all families that wish this experience, to experience it. Passing this legislation will advance the goal of providing every child with a loving home.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hope for Children Act. As a member of the Hope Coalition, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for their energy on this bill this year, for guiding it through the Committee on Ways and Means.

I would like to thank the members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the other member of the Hope for Children Coalition, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. Bliley, as others have said, first introduced this legislation in the 106th Congress. I was the lead sponsor the next year. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has always been a real driver and a real enthusiastic supporter of this legislation.

All of us, no matter what party we belong to or what political philosophy we subscribe to, we want children to have a loving and a permanent home.

No children should ever be denied the chance to live with a family that will love and cherish them. This tax credit will make it possible for more families to open their homes and their hearts to a child through adoption.

The high cost of adoption is an insurmountable obstruction to many families who want to adopt a child. With this tax credit, we can help ease that financial burden, sometimes enormous, and ensure more children find a permanent, loving home.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, many people do not realize just how expensive adoptions are: medical bills, legal fees, travel costs. We owe it to those wanting children to ease these burdens. Passage of this bill will unquestionably make a meaningful difference in the lives of thousands of children.

One of those children is the son of my chief of staff, who Members can imagine has been very enthusiastic since he adopted Wyatt Emerson about a year and a half ago. I can tell the Members that Wyatt has made a difference in the Emerson family, and the Emerson family has made a difference in him.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

□ 1200

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act.

In the past quarter century, the number of children in foster care has grown much faster than the number of children adopted. Yet, despite the large number of children of adoptable age, the adoption rate is still significantly low. A primary reason for this is the costs of adoption which can require a family to spend, as my colleagues have heard, up to \$30,000 to provide a child with a home.

The average American family just does not have this kind of money. The Hope for Children Act seeks to remedy this problem by increasing the adoption tax credit to \$10,000. There are more people who want to adopt than there are children who are eligible for adoption.

This essential legislation will allow more children to be adopted by loving families who so desperately want them. These children deserve to be loved and deserve to be wanted. We need to help these families be joined together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Hope for Children Act.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hope for Children Act. This is an important measure that encourages adoption and provides tax relief at the same time.

One of the biggest blessings is to have someone to call mom and dad. I am in full support of this measure that

would help provide loving families and parents to children who are without a permanent place to call home.

The Hope for Children Act will enable more American families to adopt, and as a Congress we should do all we can to promote adoption.

As others have said before me, my predecessor Tom Bliley was the original cosponsor of the Hope for Children Act, he worked tirelessly to garner 280 cosponsors for this legislation last year.

The Hope for Children Act was included in major tax legislation passed by the House, but unfortunately did not become law. I applaud the efforts of those who have brought this legislation to the floor, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

As a cofounder of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, Tom Bliley sponsored over one dozen different adoption bills. As chairman of the House Committee on Commerce, Mr. Bliley played a major role in the Foster Care Independence Act, the Adoption and Safe Families Act, and the Adoption Awareness Act.

In addition to promoting adoption domestically, he secured aid for displaced orphans overseas while working to enact the Hague Intercountry Adoption Act.

Tom Bliley truly stood up for children without a voice, and his leadership on adoption issues is much appreciated by a grateful Nation. His efforts have helped children in need of loving homes and families find happiness.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in helping more of those children in need by supporting the Hope for Children Act.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, few Americans realize that it can cost between \$8,000 and \$30,000 to adopt a child nowadays. That is a problem we should also be addressing. But until we do, American couples need help.

Too many loving families say no to adoption because they cannot afford it. Others have to take out a second mortgage. They should not have to do that.

The Hope for Children Act will extend and increase the adoption tax credit for families who adopt. This is more than a good idea, it is a necessary measure. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), my friend, for taking the lead on this measure.

I think we should also thank our former colleague, Tom Bliley, who worked so hard to advance this legislation for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, every child deserves a loving home, but we need to help adopting families overcome the financial impediments to taking a child into their home.

This is a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), my friend, for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, all of the arguments in favor of this extraordinarily good legislation have been stated. I just want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) for his sponsorship of the legislation, for working overtime to garner the number of cosponsors that he did from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, when I look around at the speakers today, who really have been the movers and shakers, it reminds me of that famous statement out of Casablanca: Round up the usual suspects. And you have got the same key players, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and so many others, who are always there trying to advance the ball and advance the cause of adoption and to provide a loving option to a mother who may find herself in a very difficult situation.

I want to commend all of those who have made this legislation possible. The \$5,000 credit certainly has had a laudable impact on adoption and I am pleased to be an original sponsor of that. This legislation now doubles the tax credit, which I think is very generous, and hopefully not the end of our efforts to help those who would like to make an adoption plan and bring a child or children into their home.

This is a great bill. I urge everyone's support for it.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the reminder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I would urge our colleagues to support this legislation. I think it is a very important bill that moves forward the cause for adopting parents and bringing families together.

I would like to just repeat the concern that I expressed earlier in regards to special-needs children and their adoption. A report issued by the Treasury Department in October of last year pointed out that this bill might have an unintended consequence of making it actually more difficult for special-needs children to find homes.

The reason, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill will make it a little bit less difficult for parents to participate in international adoptions where the majority of children are now available.

We do not have many children available in this country for adoption other than special-needs children; other than family relations. And this might, in

fact, make it a little bit easier for a family to go for an international adoption rather than a special-needs adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I know that is not the intent of the legislation. I know that the committee will continue to work on this, but I would just urge my colleagues, as this bill works its way through the process, we need to go back at least to the original provisions in the bill, to make it easier for families that wish to adopt special-needs children.

We have a tremendous need there. This bill presents an opportunity, and I would encourage us, as the bill works its way through Congress, to address that need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for his effort on this legislation, and also for his comments. As the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, mentioned, he would like to work with the gentleman in terms of finding a way to assist special-needs adoption, adoptive parents with the costs, and do it in a way that really had some connection to the adoption expenses that might actually be incurred by a family. Because, obviously, we are all here, and we heard from a number of speakers from both parties who are very much wanting to strengthen the ability of people to adopt, to strengthen families, to try to find a way to make adoption easier and more frequent, and I am hopeful that we can resolve that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day in the Congress. This is excellent legislation that has been worked on for more than this Congress, and really was the effort of former member and chairman Mr. Bilely to bring this increase in the adoption tax credit to the floor, obviously make it permanent, so that the planning of families and agencies can go forward in trying to find and place children into loving homes.

This is an excellent bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, every year thousands of Americans open their homes to children without permanent families in order to provide these youngsters with stable and caring upbringings. Because of this, adopted children, who once had no one to turn to, find themselves surrounded with unconditional love and devotion. Adoptive parents not only unselfishly decide to share their homes with a child but also choose to share their hearts and lives so that their children can grow in happy, nurturing surroundings.

However, adopting a child is difficult in part because the cost of adoption continues to increase. A family can spend upwards of \$20,000 just to make it possible to provide children with a loving home. These families should not be financially burdened by the exorbitant costs of adoption.

Thousands of individuals want to give a child a loving home but cannot due to the

huge expense. Adoption costs should not be an insurmountable obstacle for these individuals. We have a responsibility to these men and women to open the doors to adoption, not shut them. And we have an even bigger responsibility to help a child find the family he or she needs.

The Hope for Children Act exemplifies how Congress can help these families and how we can provide more children with the opportunity to live happier, successful lives.

This important legislation would increase the tax credit each adoption to \$10,000 and make the process more affordable for middle-class families. Present law only provides a \$5,000 tax credit per adoption and a \$6,000 tax credit for the adoption of a special-needs child. The current tax credit is far below the actual cost of adopting a child. Furthermore, the Hope for Children Act would index the credit for inflation and increase the earnings limit, expanding eligibility for the tax credit. The Hope for Children Act would also make the adoption tax credit permanent law, repealing the sunset, and exempt the beneficiaries of the credit from the Alternative Minimum Tax. This will ensure that parents receive the full benefit of this credit.

Children who are without permanent families should not be penalized, and families who want to open their homes to these children should not have to struggle financially. Let us provide these families with the opportunity to open their hearts and homes to a child in need. Let us pass the Hope for Children Act.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 662, the Hope for Children Act. Knowing of the importance adoption plays in the lives of American families, Congress should do more to help facilitate and promote its benefits. I am pleased that the House of Representatives passed this bill earlier today with bipartisan and unanimous support. This action speaks to the strength of this legislation, and I hope the United States Senate moves quickly to follow the lead of the House.

Unquestionably, this legislation would tear down the financial burdens imposed on adoptive parents. These expenses can add up to \$20,000 or more in a single year and continue to be the primary disincentive to middle-class families. While families who have children born to them often enjoy the fact that health insurance pays for the birth of their children, adoptive families receive no such support. H.R. 662 offsets this imbalance and makes the process a more financially viable option for middle-income parents to build families through adoption.

Mr. Speaker, few can argue that adoption does not result in moving children out of foster homes and providing the benefit of a solid home and possibilities for a bright future. The benefits of adoption exist not only with the adopted child, but with the biological mother and society as well. Adoption can help break the cycle of abortion that too often takes place with young girls having babies out of wedlock. By choosing adoption, women can feel good about themselves by making the right decision—not to have an abortion.

At the same time, adoption can help break the cycle of single parenting. More than eighty percent of all females born to single mothers under the age of 16 become teenage mothers themselves. By choosing adoption as an alternative to single parenting, these women can continue their education, develop job skills and

a sense of independence, and live the rest of their lives knowing they were not forced to choose abortion over single parenting.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of fairness to adoptive families. H.R. 662 is good public policy and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my fellow 'Hope Coalition' members who joined with me in introducing the 'Hope for Children Act' (H.R. 622). I will be very proud to see H.R. 622 pass the House of Representatives with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Every child deserves a permanent, loving home and, with so many families who want to open their hearts and their homes to these children, I firmly believe we should help remove the financial barriers that may hinder this union. By extending a \$10,000 tax credit to families who adopt a child, The Hope for Children Act will help to foster strong, healthy families across the nation.

The promotion of special needs adoptions is essential. Families who adopt special needs children incur significant costs after an adoption has taken place. It must be mentioned that the Hope for Children Act, as introduced, included a \$10,000 flat tax credit for families who adopt children with special needs. Though this measure was eliminated in Committee, I will not stop fighting to ensure that the needs of these children and families are adequately addressed.

Across America, there are an estimated 122,000 children waiting for a family to love and care for them. But with adoption costs ranging from \$8,000 to \$20,000, many families can not afford this huge expense. No child should be forced to grow up without a family because of the tremendous cost of adoption.

It has been a privilege and an honor to work with the members of the 'Hope Coalition' in ensuring that this legislation passed the House of Representatives. Please be assured that I will continue to do all that I can to make sure that the Hope for Children Act becomes law.

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hope for Children Act. This much needed legislation would help more children be placed in loving homes by easing the financial burden of adopting a child. By increasing the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for all adoptions and increasing the employer adoption assistance exclusion to \$10,000, more families would be able to adopt. Adoption costs have risen over the years, costing families anywhere between \$8,000 and \$30,000 to adopt a child.

It is important that we pass this Hope for Children Act today because the current \$5,000 tax credit for non-special needs adoptions expires this year, as well as the current \$5,000 exclusion for employer-provided adoption assistance. This tax credit helps make the adoption process more affordable for middle-class families.

Helping to unite children with adoptive parents is an issue that we can all agree on. There is perhaps no greater undertaking than raising a child, nor more rewarding an experience. Thousands of children are waiting to be adopted, waiting for the day they are welcomed into a loving home where they can grow and flourish. Let's help make the dream of so many families become a reality by passing the Hope for Children Act today.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hope for Children Act. As a member of this chamber and as the father of two

adopted children, I want to thank Reps. DEMINT, OBERSTAR, PRYCE, KING and BACHUS and the entire Congressional Coalition on Adoption for their dedication to the well-being of our Nation's and our world's children.

It is fitting that we consider this bill less than a week after celebrating Mother's Day and so close to Father's Day. These two days have been set aside for us to thank our parents for raising us, for giving us a sense of security and independence, and for offering us their unconditional love. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all parents, who know that there is no more important, more difficult, and ultimately more rewarding undertaking than raising a child.

I was very fortunate to have been raised by loving parents in a stable and caring home. I can't help but be reminded, however, of the over 500,000 children in our Nation's foster care system, many of whom need permanent homes. Although we have made great strides in improving the child welfare system, there is no substitute for a loving parents and a permanent home. For the thousands of children who wait, adoption offers the gift of hope, the gift of love, and the gift of family.

My own family was forever changed and enriched by the adoption of our two children from Korea. It is difficult for me to express how deeply grateful I am to have Kathryn and Scott in my life. As any parent can attest, the love I have for my children knows no bounds.

As many of my colleagues also know, families can spend anywhere from \$8,000 to \$30,000, or even more, to adopt a child. I am proud, therefore, to be a cosponsor of the Hope for Children Act, which helps offset the financial impact of adoption. By raising the limit on the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 and making it permanent for all adoptions, I hope that this measure will open thousands of more homes and hearts to the miracle of adoption.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not point out what I believe is one shortcoming of this legislation. All children, regardless of age, medical need, disability, race or creed deserve a family to share their love. We need to do more to encourage the adoption of special needs children, those who are hardest to place in permanent homes.

Since State foster care programs cover most of the tax qualified expenses associated with special needs adoptions, only about 15% of adoptive parents of special needs children can benefit from the credit. These parents, however, incur other substantial adoption-related costs, such as out-of-pocket medical costs, counseling services, and lost income from work. As parents, legislators and advocates, we must give all children the chance to find a family. I thank the leadership for indicating their willingness to work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Hope for Children Act and look forward to working with them to strengthen this bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Hope for Children Act and I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I have heard from many families back home in western Wisconsin of the need for an increased adoption tax credit. The Hope for Children Act seeks to ease the financial burden on many families who adopt children. It will increase the adoption tax credit from \$5,000 to \$10,000 for families who adopt chil-

dren and make this credit permanent, which is due to expire at the end of this year. Furthermore, it will index the credit for inflation and increase the earnings limit, expanding the eligibility for the tax credit.

As a father of two sons, I understand how important it is for children to grow up in a loving and stable family environment. We must find a way to help the thousands of children who have no permanent family. I believe extending this tax credit is one of the most important ways to help these children and the families who adopt them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all those families who have adopted and cared for so many children that would otherwise never have known the true meaning of a loving, caring family. I hope with this legislation we will ease the high cost of adoption for many families.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this common-sense legislation to give our nation's needy children and loving families hope.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the Hope for Children Act, I rise in strong support of its passage and urge all my colleagues to vote for this important family-building bill.

Just last Sunday, children young and old took time from their daily routine to remember their mothers on Mothers' Day. These are the women who have nurtured their children, giving them life, hope, happiness, and love. In just a few weeks, we will similarly honor our fathers on Fathers' Day, remembering the men in our lives who have taught us so much about life's ups and downs, ins and outs.

But for thousands of children, there is no one to honor on these special days and nothing to celebrate. For one reason or another, they are without parents or families. Thankfully, there are thousands of men and women who want to open up their homes to these children and make them a part of their families. Adoption makes this possible.

In 1992, the last year for which total adoption statistics are available, 127,441 children were adopted in the United States. Nearly 7,000 of those children were adopted in my home state of Florida, which has the fourth largest number of adoptions in the country. Some of these children were adopted by relatives, others by total strangers. Some of them came from overseas, others from across the street. All are loved and wanted. It made no difference to the children or the parents that they don't look the same; it only mattered that they needed one another.

Regrettably, many of these important unions are kept from ever occurring because the costs of adopting can be more than a family can bear. The adoption processes can cost between \$8,000 and \$30,000. The adoption tax credit helps to ease this financial burden and remove this obstacle. But, without our action here today, that tax credit will expire.

Mr. Speaker, the Hope for Children Act permanently extends and raises that tax credit to \$10,000. Furthermore, it raises the employer adoption assistance exclusion to \$10,000. By enacting this legislation into law this year, families can take advantage of this tax credit when filling out their 2002 tax returns.

This bill is just plain good policy, Mr. Speaker. We should do all we can to encourage adoption and to make families stronger. I ask all of my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my strong support for H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act. I am proud to be joined by so many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle as an original cosponsor of this important legislation that will remove some of the unnecessary financial burdens that have long plagued the adoption process. I believe that it will also pave the way for children to be raised in safe, caring environments by an adoptive family.

It is estimated that the average adoptive family can spend from \$8,000 to \$30,000 to adopt a child. In addition, the lack of adoptive families leaves children in an intermediate state, waiting for an average of four years for an adoptive family. The Hope for Children Act will increase the tax credit a family receives for adopting any child to \$10,000, up from the current amount of only \$5,000 and \$6,000 for special needs children. This credit will make adoption more affordable for middle-class families. Under current law, the tax-credit will expire on December 31, 2001 for non-special needs children; however, under the Hope for Children Act, the tax credit will be permanently extended. Also, the credit would be indexed to inflation, meaning that as inflation rates rise, so would the tax credit the adopting family receives, for all families with incomes below \$150,000.

In my District, I have witnessed the beneficial effects of outside funding for adoption services. In September 2000, the Catholic Family Services of Hartford, Connecticut, was awarded \$250,000 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to help increase the number of Latino children placed in adoption and the number of Latino families that are licensed for adoption and foster care. The program is designed to help facilitate the moving of children out of the child welfare system and into permanent adoptive homes. This project helps those in the community help themselves and provides loving homes to children who deserve them. This has been a wonderful service to provide children with and the best way to safeguard their future.

Mr. Speaker, adoption is a very sensitive and personal matter. Adoption is an option left to couples that, often times, have endured an intense personal trauma. The least we can do is to lift some of the financial burdens brought on by the adoption process to let adoptive families focus on the most important ingredient in the process, the children. I applaud the strong commitment so many of my colleagues have made to the Hope for Children Act. It is my hope that passage of the Hope for Children Act will put children into loving and secure homes. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 622, the Hope For Children Act which will increase the adoption tax credit for families. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and I commend the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT for his leadership on this important issue.

Today's high cost for adoptions causes many couples to dismiss adoption as an option. With thousands of children in foster care needing homes, and thousands more being put up for adoption by parents who cannot care for them, the United States needs to make adoption financially possible for more American families. A typical adoption can cost a family anywhere from \$8,000 to \$30,000

leading some families to take second mortgages on their homes or accumulate other serious debt. This cost leaves many children in the foster care system permanently.

H.R. 622 will help ease this financial burden so that children are quickly placed in permanent and loving homes, which will encourage the development of more stable families and help more children bypass the foster care system. Studies have shown this stability discourages children from becoming involved in crime or depending upon welfare.

This legislation will increase the adoption tax credit for families who adopt special needs children from \$6,000 to \$10,000. The credit for families who adopt non-special needs children is increased from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and extended permanently. Moreover this legislation increases the income cap at which the credit begins to phase out from \$75,000 to \$150,000.

As a parent of an adoptive child, I personally know that bringing a child into your home is one of the most gratifying and fulfilling things a parent can do. If we can encourage more families to adopt by making it financially possible, thousands of children will benefit. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important and timely legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 622, the Hope for Children Act. This much needed legislation is an important step toward providing every child a loving, permanent home.

I thank and commend my colleagues for sponsoring and moving this legislation forward. I know that they must share my passion and commitment to our nation's children. H.R. 622 responds to a very real need in the lives of some of our nation's most vulnerable children, those awaiting adoption.

Under current law, a taxpayer may deduct expenses of up to \$5,000 relating to the adoption of a child, and up to \$6,000 for the adoption of a "special needs" child. The credit is phased out for taxpayers with annual income above \$75,000. The adoption credit for special needs children is permanent, but the credit for the adoption of other children is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. Under current law, beginning in 2002, the adoption credit could not be used to reduce tax liability under the alternative minimum tax (AMT).

This bill increases the adoption tax credit to \$10,000, up from \$6,000 for special-needs children and \$5,000 for all other children. It also makes permanent the adoption credit for children without special needs. Under the measure, the adoption credit could be applied against alternative minimum tax liability.

Current law also permits an employee to exclude up to \$5,000 in adoption expenses (\$6,000 for special-needs children) from taxable income for expenses reimbursed to the employee through an employer-sponsored adoption-assistance program. This provision is also set to expire on December 31. The measure increases to \$10,000 the amount that an employee may exclude from taxable income for expenses reimbursed through an employer adoption assistance program. The measure also makes permanent the adoption-assistance exclusion.

The measure increases the beginning point of the income phase-out range for both the adoption credit and the adoption-assistance program exclusion from \$75,000 to \$150,000.

During 1999, the most recent year for which data is available, nationally over 820,000 chil-

dren went through the foster care system, and 568,000 were in the system at year's end. Of the children adopted from foster care in 1999, 48 percent waited more than one year from the time they became legally free for adoption until they were placed in an adoptive home. The mean length of time in foster care is 46 months.

In my home state of Texas, at least 17,000 children were in foster care at the end of 1998, the last year for which that data is available. This is an increase of nearly 255% from the 1990 foster care population and an overwhelming increase of 363% from 1986. During that year, the Texas foster care system served over 20,000 children.

Approximately one half of these foster children are minorities. Studies have shown that minority children wait longer to be adopted than do white children. According to the National Council for Adoption (NCFA), African American children constitute about 43 percent of the children awaiting adoption in the foster care system, Hispanics 15 percent. In Harris County, 78 percent of all foster children are minorities.

Thus, it is crucial that we do all we can to encourage adoption. However, many parents who want to open their hearts and homes to a child through adoption cannot do so because of the great expense. Adoption can cost thousands of dollars, and so the cost is the primary obstacle to bringing together loving families and children who need a home.

Today, we can take an action that will have a direct impact on the lives of children. Please join me in doing so.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hope for Children Act and thank Chairman THOMAS, former Congressman Bliley, and the bipartisan Hope Coalition for introducing this legislation. I have supported this legislation for several years and am proud to currently be one of 289 cosponsors.

Approximately 50,000 children are adopted nationwide each year. According to the State Department's annual report, the number of international adoptions increased approximately 13 percent from 1998 to 2000. According to Adoptions Forever, an adoption agency in Maryland, the average aggregate cost of adoption for these international orphans ranges up to \$30,000, while a domestic adoption can range up to \$12,000. Passing the Hope for Children Act will ease the burden of what can be an expensive obstacle to sharing your home life with a child in need.

Currently, tax credits provided for adoption of children without special needs will expire at the end of this year. The credit is currently \$5,000 for children without special needs, \$6,000 for children with special needs. H.R. 622 promotes adoption opportunities by preserving and expanding tax credits for those families that choose to adopt.

The Montgomery County division for child welfare provides lawyers and travel compensation for adoptive parents. Despite this coverage of general adoption payments, the division has more children with special needs than they can place. With a \$10,000 tax credit, an organization like the Montgomery County division of child welfare will attract more potential adoptive families, leaving fewer special needs children without homes.

Enacting the Hope for Children Act allows us to build we must build on current suc-

cesses of tax credits for adoptive families and send our support for families who adopt. Adoption allows children who otherwise would be without a nurturing home to experience childhood with a supporting family. Every family that wants to adopt should have the opportunity to adopt. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Adoption, I encourage my colleagues to join me and the bipartisan Hope Coalition in supporting H.R. 622.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the bill, this Member wishes to add his strong support of H.R. 622, the Hope for the Children Act, and would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, for bringing this important legislation to the House floor today.

As you know, the high cost for adoptions causes many couples to dismiss adoption as too costly. Other families have taken second mortgages on their home or accumulated other debt. Because families spend anywhere from \$8,000 to \$30,000 to adopt a child, these high costs mean that many children do not get adopted and stay in the foster care system permanently.

The Hope for Children Act will ease the burden of this expense by increasing the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for all adoptions. While this credit will not completely cover the often exorbitant costs associated with adoptions, it will provide a healthy start toward ensuring more children find a loving home.

This bill will encourage the creation of more families and help more children bypass the foster care system to enter in to a permanent arrangement. This much needed stability will also mean that these children will have better, more stable home environments and that they will be less likely to become future burdens on society either through crime or welfare.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 622.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the "Hope for Children Act of 2001." This important legislation continues our commitment to providing families assistance when adopting children who might otherwise be in need of a loving home. I've had many constituents tell me that the current costs of adoption can, in many cases, exceed \$25,000 or even \$30,000. Raising the adoption tax credit from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and making it permanent will go a long way toward alleviating the burden of these burdensome costs.

I truly believe that there is no greater gift that a person can give than placing a child in a loving and nurturing environment. There are many young couples today looking to adopt a child, but the costs associated with adoption prevent them from this noble mission. I do not believe that this legislation creates an artificial incentive for people to adopt. They simply want to bring a child into the world and give it all of the love and affection they have to offer. The adoption tax credit just makes it easier for people to fulfill that dream.

I have raised a household full of children. I've watched them grow and mature into fine individuals. I've been there through good times and bad. Nothing has brought me greater joy in my life than my children and I hope this bill will give people across America that same opportunity.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hope for the Children Act and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important legislation.

This bill will help more families provide loving homes to more children by increasing the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for all adoptions and increase the employer adoption assistance exclusion to \$10,000. Because families can spend anywhere from \$8,000 to \$30,000 to adopt a child, this assistance is vital to ensure children quickly find a permanent, loving home. Many parents who want to open their hearts and homes to a child through adoption cannot because of the huge expense. This bill removes some of the financial obstacles to finding families for these children.

Adoption is a beautiful expression of family values, for it allows people the opportunity to extend their homes and their hearts to people in need. It is my sincere hope that passage of this legislation will encourage many more people to adopt and encourage individuals to consider adoption as an alternative when they are not ready to be parents. It is essential to raise the awareness of the benefits of adoption in our effort to provide for all children throughout the world.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hope for Children Act. As a member of this Chamber, and, more importantly, as the father of two adopted children, I thank Representatives DEMINT, OBERSTAR, PRYCE, KING, and BACHUS and the entire Congressional Coalition on Adoption for their dedication to the well-being of our Nation's and our world's children.

It is fitting that we consider this bill less than a week after celebrating Mother's Day and so close to Father's Day, 2 days that have been set aside for us to thank our parents for raising us, for giving us a sense of security and independence, and for offering us their unconditional love. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all parents, who know that there is no more important, more difficult, and ultimately more rewarding undertaking than raising a child.

I was very fortunate to have been raised by a loving mother in a stable and caring home. I can't help but be reminded, however, of the over 500,000 children in our Nation's foster care system who await permanent homes. Although in recent years we have made great strides in improving the child welfare system, there is no substitute for a loving parents and a permanent home. For the thousands of children who wait, adoption offers the gift of hope, the gift of love, and the gift of family.

My own family was forever changed and enriched by the adoption of our two children from Korea. It is difficult for me to express how deeply grateful I am to have Kathryn and Scott in my life. As any parent can attest, the love I have for my children knows no bounds.

As many of my colleagues can attest, families can spend anywhere from \$8,000 to \$20,000, or even higher, to adopt a child. I am proud, therefore, to be a cosponsor of the Hope for Children Act, which helps offset the financial impact of adoption. By raising the limit on the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for all adoptions, and making it permanent, I hope that this measure will open thousands of more homes and hearts to the miracle of adoption.

I would be in error, however, not to point out what I believe is one shortcoming of this legislation. All children, regardless of age, medical

need, disability, race or creed deserve a family to share their love. We need to do more to encourage the adoption of special needs children, those who are hardest to place in permanent homes.

Since State foster care programs cover most of the tax qualified expenses associated with special needs adoptions, only about 15 percent of adoptive parents of special needs children can benefit from the credit. These parents, however, incur other substantial adoption-related costs, such as out-of-pocket medical costs, counseling services, and lost income from work. As parents, legislators and advocates, we owe all children, regardless of need, a chance to find a family. I thank the leadership for indicating their willingness to work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Hope for Children Act and look forward to working with them to strengthen this bill.

1. Average cost of adoptions are between \$8,000-\$30,000, depending upon circumstances (i.e. international, special needs, etc.)

2. There are about 550,000 children in our nation's foster care system waiting to be adopted. About 120,000 of these children are special needs children, meaning they are more difficult to place because of their age, medical condition, physical or mental handicap, membership in a minority, or being part of a group of siblings waited to be adopted together.

3. The Hope for Children Act, which you cosponsored, increases and expands the adoption tax credit. In general, it:

Increases the limit on the credit for non-special needs children from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and makes it permanent (it would expire this year).

Increases the limit on the credit for special-needs adoptions from \$6,000 to \$10,000 (it is already permanent).

Increases the limit on the employer adoption assistance exclusion from \$5,000 (\$6,000 for special-needs adoptions) to \$10,000 for all adoptions and makes it permanent.

Increases the income limit for the full credit from \$75,000 to \$150,000. Phases out the credit for incomes between \$150,000-\$190,000.

Indexes the credit for inflation.

4. While the bill as introduced makes the special-needs credit a non-qualified credit, the Chairman's mark does not. A non-qualified credit is very important to the special needs and adoption community. Only about 15% of adoptive parents of special needs children incur enough in qualified expenses to benefit from the credit, these parents incur substantial indirect costs through counseling, medical services, home improvements for disabled children, etc.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 141, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	DeMint	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	Deutsch	(TX)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Jefferson
Akin	Dicks	Jenkins
Allen	Dingell	John
Andrews	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Armey	Dooley	Johnson (IL)
Baca	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Bachus	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Baird	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Baker	Duncan	Jones (OH)
Baldacci	Dunn	Kanjorski
Baldwin	Edwards	Kaptur
Ballenger	Ehlers	Keller
Barcia	Ehrlich	Kelly
Barr	Emerson	Kennedy (MN)
Barrett	Engel	Kerns
Bartlett	English	Kildee
Barton	Eshoo	Kind (WI)
Bass	Etheridge	King (NY)
Becerra	Evans	Kingston
Bentsen	Everett	Kirk
Bereuter	Farr	Klecza
Berkley	Fattah	Knollenberg
Berman	Ferguson	Kolbe
Berry	Filner	Kucinich
Biggert	Flake	LaFalce
Billakis	Fletcher	LaHood
Bishop	Foley	Lampson
Blagojevich	Ford	Langevin
Blumenauer	Fossella	Lantos
Blunt	Frank	Larsen (WA)
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Larson (CT)
Boehner	Frost	Latham
Bonilla	Gallely	LaTourette
Bonior	Gekas	Leach
Bono	Gephardt	Lee
Boswell	Gibbons	Levin
Boucher	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Boyd	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Brady (TX)	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Brown (FL)	Goode	Linder
Brown (OH)	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Brown (SC)	Gordon	LoBiondo
Bryant	Goss	Lofgren
Burr	Graham	Lowe
Burton	Granger	Lucas (KY)
Buyer	Graves	Luther
Callahan	Green (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Calvert	Green (WI)	Maloney (NY)
Camp	Greenwood	Manzullo
Cannon	Grucci	Markey
Cantor	Gutierrez	Masara
Capito	Gutknecht	Matheson
Capps	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Cardin	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Harman	McCollum
Carson (OK)	Hart	McCrery
Castle	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Chambliss	Hayes	McHugh
Clay	Hayworth	McInnis
Clayton	Hefley	McIntyre
Clement	Herger	McKeon
Clyburn	Hill	McKinney
Coble	Hilleary	McNulty
Collins	Hilliard	Meehan
Combest	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Conyers	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Cooksey	Hobson	Menendez
Costello	Hoefel	Mica
Coyne	Hoekstra	Millender-
Cramer	Holden	McDonald
Crane	Holt	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Honda	Miller, Gary
Crowley	Hoolley	Miller, George
Culberson	Horn	Mink
Cummings	Hostettler	Moakley
Cunningham	Houghton	Mollohan
Davis (CA)	Hoyer	Moore
Davis (FL)	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Davis (IL)	Hutchinson	Moran (VA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Morella
Davis, Tom	Inslee	Murtha
Deal	Isakson	Myrick
DeFazio	Israel	Nadler
DeGette	Issa	Napolitano
Delahunt	Istook	Neal
DeLauro	Jackson (IL)	Nethercutt
DeLay		Ney

Northup	Rothman	Sununu
Norwood	Roukema	Sweeney
Nussle	Roybal-Allard	Tancredo
Oberstar	Royce	Tanner
Obey	Rush	Tauscher
Olver	Ryan (WI)	Tauzin
Ortiz	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Osborne	Sabo	Taylor (NC)
Ose	Sanchez	Terry
Otter	Sanders	Thomas
Owens	Sandinlin	Thompson (CA)
Oxley	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Saxton	Thornberry
Pascarell	Scarborough	Thune
Pastor	Schaffer	Thurman
Paul	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Payne	Schiff	Tiberi
Pelosi	Schrock	Tierney
Pence	Scott	Toomey
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Peterson (PA)	Serrano	Trafficant
Petri	Sessions	Turner
Phelps	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Pickering	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Pitts	Shays	Upton
Platts	Sherman	Velazquez
Pombo	Sherwood	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Vitter
Portman	Shows	Walden
Price (NC)	Shuster	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Wamp
Putnam	Simpson	Waters
Quinn	Skeen	Watkins
Radanovich	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Slaughter	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Reyes	Snyder	Weller
Reynolds	Solis	Wexler
Riley	Souder	Whitfield
Rivers	Spence	Wicker
Rodriguez	Spratt	Wilson
Roemer	Stark	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Woolsey
Rogers (MI)	Stenholm	Wu
Rohrabacher	Strickland	Wynn
Ros-Lehtinen	Stump	Young (AK)
Ross	Stupak	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Borski	Cubin	Kennedy (RI)
Brady (PA)	Ganske	Kilpatrick
Condit	Gilman	Largent
Cox	Hunter	Lucas (OK)

□ 1232

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was speaking at a Liberian rally and could not make it back in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably delayed. Accordingly, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 122, 123, and 124. If I had been present I would have voted "yea" on all. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement placed in the RECORD at the appropriate point.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 143 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 143

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) a bill to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 143 makes in order the bill H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, under a structured rule. The rule provides 2 hours of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, debatable for the time specified, equally controlled by a proponent and opponent. These amendments shall not be subject to amendment or demands for a division of the question.

The Committee on Rules worked very hard to ensure that the amendments made in order reflect the variety of views in this House of Representatives on education policy. I think the result is a balanced rule that gives the House the opportunity to work its will on a variety of issues related to the education of our children. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today we take a historic leap forward on behalf of our children, parents, and teachers across this great Nation. Lately, the attention of Americans has been drawn to the problems of high gas prices and sustainability of our resources. America, it is time to focus that attention on our Nation's most precious resource: our children. H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, does just that.

We understand that the future of this great Nation lies in a global economy, and H.R. 1 recognizes that investing in our children today will prepare them and our country for the challenges of tomorrow. The Committee on Education and the Workforce was assigned the arduous task of reforming our Nation's failing Federal education policy. Although there have been many bumps in the road, I am pleased to stand before my colleagues today to present a rule on a bipartisan piece of legislation that will transform the Federal role in education to ensure that no child is left behind.

During testimony in the Committee on Rules, we heard time and time again, from both Republicans and Democrats, that H.R. 1 represents the most sweeping comprehensive education legislation to be brought before the House during our tenure. It has been a long time in coming and this bill is truly historic. The education of our Nation's children is the number one concern of Americans, and H.R. 1 is the number one priority of our President.

I would like to take a moment to congratulate my colleague and good friend from the great State of Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his hard work and commitment to improving educational opportunities for our children, and I would also like to congratulate and commend the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for his hard work and support of this bipartisan legislation.

Despite a decade of economic growth and a Federal outlay of more than \$130 billion in the last 25 years, the achievement gap dividing our Nation's disadvantaged students and their peers has continued to widen. Mr. Speaker, the message is loud and clear: money alone cannot be the vehicle for change in our public schools. It is time for accountability, it is time for reform, and it is time for a commitment to our children.

We must start by determining which students are in need of additional help and which schools and school districts are in need of improvement. H.R. 1 accomplishes this task by implementing annual assessments in the core subjects of reading and math for students in grades three through eight. However, the bill also recognizes that communities know more about their children than Washington bureaucrats. H.R. 1 respects local control by allowing States to design and implement these tests and provide Federal funds to aid them in that task. It also explicitly prohibits federally sponsored national testing or curricula.

Armed with knowledge from these assessments we will be able to determine which schools are failing to educate our children, and this information will be readily available to parents in the form of an annual school performance report card. Based on these facts, H.R. 1 provides a system of accountability to ensure that students do not become trapped in chronically failing schools.

As passed out of committee, H.R. 1 provides immediate public school choice for children in schools identified as failing after just 1 year. That is public school choice. This provision will give parents the freedom to choose a better-performing public or charter school to educate their children. The bill also allows parents to seek supplemental educational services, such as tutoring, after-school services, and summer school programs for their children if they are enrolled in a school that has been identified as a failing school for more than 3 years. This measure will act as a necessary safety valve to allow students to seek outside educational support for any state-approved provider using Federal title I dollars.

Now, in exchange for these new accountability measures, the plan will dramatically enhance flexibility for local school districts, granting them the freedom to transfer up to 50 percent of the Federal education dollars they receive among an assortment of ESEA programs. This decentralized approach will allow agencies to better target resources to fit the needs of their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, since the creation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, numerous programs and restrictions have been piled and piled upon the act, creating a bureaucratic maze of duplicative policies, all well intentioned, but amazingly inefficient. H.R. 1 will give some needed organization to this patchwork of programs by consolidating or eliminating 34 programs under ESEA and cutting the Federal education bureaucracy in half. At the same time, the bill will target effective proven methods of reading through the implementation of the President's Reading First initiative.

Mr. Speaker, we know that over 60 percent of children living in poverty are reading below the very basic level.

We cannot expect these children to exceed with this handicap. At the same time, we destine these children to academic underachievement by our failure to teach them to read; we are denying them access to the world that may be opened up to them only through books. The President's Reading and Early Reading First programs will introduce a scientific-based, comprehensive approach to reading instruction and will serve to refocus education policy on this most fundamental skill.

The President's education plan, No Child Left Behind, also emphasizes two other fundamental areas of education through the establishment of math and science partnerships. The United States cannot remain a world leader without the math and science knowledge that has made us a leader in technology and scientific discovery. I am very pleased that H.R. 1 includes an initiative which will encourage States to partner with institutions of higher learning, businesses, and nonprofit math and science entities to bring enhanced math and science opportunities to local education agencies with a high need.

Mr. Speaker, the 1,000-plus pages of H.R. 1 are filled with calculated reforms that will restructure Federal education policy. It includes provisions to increase safety in our schools, promote English fluency, and improve teacher quality. It encompasses the education plan laid out by our President and provides us with the most important change in Federal education policy in over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, every Member in this House has a vested interest in the education of our children as the Nation's most precious resource. We cannot stand idly by or be timid in fulfilling our responsibility to ensure that every child, rich or poor, white or of color, gifted or disabled have access to an education that gives them every chance to reach their full potential and exceed their goals and their parents' dreams for their future. As we debate this historic legislation, I urge my colleagues to keep the children at the forefront of their minds. I urge Members to support this rule and the historic underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. I oppose the process it represents, and I oppose the duplicity by which this rule came about. Nearly 150 amendments were submitted for this major legislative initiative, and only a handful have been made in order.

Furthermore, many members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce withheld offering amendments in that committee because of assurances by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman, that they would be given an opportunity to do so on the floor. That did not happen. Cut out of the process were numerous good-faith efforts to build and improve on the underlying bill.

My colleagues relied on the good-faith assurances of the Republican leadership, and learned a hard lesson instead. This is not a tone in Washington for which so many of us had hoped. For instance, this egregious rule will block consideration of an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS). The gentleman's amendment would have provided \$20 billion for needed school renovation, repair, and construction. Our schools are crumbling before our eyes.

Mr. Speaker, at the basic level, surely we can all agree that schools should provide a safe and secure environment for learning and instruction with classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other resources necessary for learning. In the same manner, the rule blocks my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), from offering an amendment to maintain a separate stream of funding for the class size reduction program.

Overcrowded classrooms remain the number one obstacles to quality education in many communities. This rule does nothing to alleviate the problem. The process for this education bill began with a lot of promise.

In recent days, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce approved, on a true bipartisan basis, a major education reform bill which will hold public schools accountable for improving children's education while offering a substantial increase in Federal funds to help them accomplish that goal.

It reflected a significant agreement between Democrats and Republicans to improve education for all children in our country regardless of their economic, social, or racial background; in other words, leaving no child behind. It provided substantial new resources, \$4 billion more for elementary and secondary education for next year, compared to what the Federal Government is spending this year, in exchange for higher standards and tough accountability rules.

But then the process began to break down. Last week Congress failed to include in the budget conference the new funds for education that were called for in today's underlying bill. The disparity between education funding in the budget and education funding in this reform bill raises real questions about whether Congress is serious about improving schools.

Furthermore, this week we have come to learn that the bipartisan bill has been hijacked by extreme elements of the majority's party, elements intent on undermining the bipartisan

agreement reached by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. These elements are intent on reinserting vouchers into the underlying bill, a move that would undermine public education. Moreover, efforts to block-grant Federal money, a proposal referred to as Straight A's, are underway and would also undermine the specific targeting of poor school districts that exists in Federal law.

I am at a loss to explain to my colleagues how so carefully crafted a bill has come under attack. The underlying bill was one this body could have been proud of, but its success is now in jeopardy. We must not let that happen. I urge the defeat of this rule to take care of these deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me this time. And I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) who worked so hard on this. It was a pleasure working with him. And I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). I also thank the Members on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), whose interest in education is great, as well as gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. I believe that President Bush deserves a tremendous amount of credit for his emphasis in terms of what he is doing in education. I will be the first to say if any one of us out of 435 had prepared this particular rule, we would have prepared it differently. This rule is a compromise rule, taking 135 amendments or so and trying to determine how we could best represent the interest of various Republican and Democrat parties in terms of bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I personally oppose a number of things in the rule. I would have liked to have seen them out of the rule. I think there are people who would have liked to see things in the rule that are not in the rule. I understand some of the opposition to it and I will oppose, as vehemently as any Member, certain aspects of this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, just to cite one, the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) dealing with assessments absolutely guts the basic bill, and it is one that I would have a great deal of trouble with.

But this is a rule. It is something that we have to move forward with. It is my determination that we should pass the rule, go on to the debate on

the various amendments, and let them fall where they may.

Mr. Speaker, why is this a good bill? It is a good bill because it is the first major piece of legislation in decades in this country, perhaps since the creation of the Department of Education, which essentially reevaluates the role of the Federal Government and makes a determination that we have to start at a very young age, particularly with kids in lower-income circumstances, and teach them how to read by the end of second grade. And in grades 3 through 8, we have to pay attention to how kids are doing. That is what the testing is all about, in order to give them the opportunity to determine if they are not doing as well as they should, and then providing for that opportunity.

We do have some consolidation into block grants to give flexibility. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was very helpful in creating local flexibility so that various people who are running the local districts could make decisions in terms of how to expend money at the local level. This gives the greatest flexibility of any legislation ever coming out of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, essentially what the President and others have done, and this is a very bipartisan bill, is that they have sat down and made the decision that the ultimate goal here is to help kids with their education and where they are going. So even if you do not agree with everything that is allowed for in the rule, as I do not, I would still urge people to support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today reflects the culmination of a lot of work and effort by all of the members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I particularly want to thank the members of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), who are part of the working group. But I want to extend that thanks to every member of the committee, all of whom had to stretch to try to bring this legislation together to try to create sound educational reform and improvement along the lines that so many Members of Congress have spoken about in our various debates, in our campaigns, talking to children and parents to try to make the American education system a better place for all of our students so they can acquire the skills necessary to participate to the fullest extent in American society.

I believe that this legislation does that. It does that because of the kind of cooperation that we received. However, I must say that I am very disappointed in the rule because I am very concerned that very crucial items for debate within the discussion of the American education system, those amendments were not allowed in order: Amendments offered by Members on this side of the aisle to deal with the issues of smaller class size, to make sure that in fact we have an environment in which teachers can teach and children can learn; to have modern and safe schools; to renovate the unsafe schools and improve schools through school construction grants; to make sure that we have adequate counselors in schools so if we see violence break out in some of our campuses, even to the extent of killings through gun violence and other forms of violence, that we have people in place who can deal with these student populations, in many cases in very difficult situations; and clearly the need for full funding for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, this is important to all of us on both sides of the aisle to make sure that funding is there. For that reason, I would ask Members to vote against this rule so that perhaps those amendments could be made in order.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), my distinguished friend and chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, whose hard work, along with his ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), has led us to this historic day.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and members of the Committee on Rules, for their long hours last night in putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for the portrait that was unveiled yesterday, and congratulations to him and hopefully his health continues to improve.

Let me, like my colleagues before me, thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my partner in this process, along with those members of the working group, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER); and on the Democratic side of the aisle, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) who have spent months looking across the table at each other, trying to develop a bipartisan bill that follows the path that the President outlined.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) pointed out, we really owe a debt of gratitude to all members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce on both sides of the aisle who had their moments of disappointment, their moments of happiness, but a willingness all of the way through the process to see us produce a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that in the 10 years that I have been here in Congress, the method in which we moved the bill through the committee and the cooperation of all of the Members was absolutely stunning. We had not one ill word said in the committee. We worked together, even when we were disagreeing, to try to produce a bill that will help children in America. I want to thank my colleagues.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) pointed out, this is an historic opportunity. President Bush has made education reform his top priority, and now the House has the opportunity to deliver on the President's promise. There are four main components of this bill. Four key principles that the President outlined during the campaign and has talked about all year: holding schools accountable to American parents; providing State and local school districts with unprecedented new flexibility; giving new choices to parents and students who are trapped in failing schools; and ensuring that student instruction is based on sound, scientific research.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 that we have coming before us embodies each of those principles and closely tracks with the President's education reform plan. We are on the threshold of the first serious overhaul of Federal education policy since it was created in 1965. There is a lot of discussion that we will have about this bill when we get to it. First, however, we have to pass the rule that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is some disappointment, disappointment on the Democratic side of the aisle and disappointment on the Republican side of the aisle on some amendments that were not made in order. However, we have produced a rule that is fair: fair for the Members, fair for the country, and fair for this bill. All of us know we have a very delicately balanced bill. The only way we are going to produce a solid, bipartisan bill is to keep a delicately balanced bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are amendments that Members would like to offer, but I think that we have a fair representation embodied in this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is a good bipartisan bill; but I oppose this rule for several reasons, one of which is the denial of any Democratic amendment on school construction.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent millions and millions of

dollars on State and local prisons during my time here in Congress, and virtually nothing on public school renovation and construction. About 15 years ago, a Federal judge in Flint, Michigan, my hometown, ordered the closing of our county jail, built in 1930, stating that it was unfit for human habitation. A few years later, we blew that jail up in compliance with that court order.

□ 1300

That jail was newer and in better condition than many schools in my congressional district, including Homedale Elementary School in my own neighborhood which is in deplorable condition. We should really be ashamed when we spend money on prisons and find some reason not to spend money on school construction and renovation. Let us at least have the opportunity to vote on school construction. It is a very nonintrusive way to help our schools, school construction and renovation. What are we really afraid of?

We have crafted a reasonable bipartisan education bill. Let us have a reasonable rule for floor action.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce would engage with me in a colloquy.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy to.

Mrs. WILSON. As the gentleman from Ohio knows, I had filed an amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), on public school choice. That amendment would have provided parents and children a better education through the public schools by eliminating barriers to full choice within public school systems. My amendment would have provided transportation expenses in public schools and creative funding mechanisms for charter school facilities, whether those facilities are leased or purchased.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio and I worked together yesterday on a version of this amendment that would be in order and that the committee could accept. That amendment would have authorized \$400 million in Federal matching funds for States to level the playing field in the area of facilities funding for charter schools and traditional public schools. Charter schools often have to choose between paying their rent and paying their teachers.

Mr. BOEHNER. Yes, I am very familiar with the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. WILSON. I understand the gentleman supported making this amendment in order and that it was inadvertently left out of the amendments that we will consider on this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. The gentlewoman is correct. I strongly support public school choice and eliminating the barriers for charter schools to educate children. The lack of funding for space is one of the biggest hurdles they face. We need to create incentives for States to provide funding mechanisms for charter schools without taking funds away from public schools. The gentlewoman has been a leader in these efforts to improve public education, and particularly crafting innovative financing mechanisms for schools. I was looking forward to working with the gentlewoman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Indiana to debate that issue on the floor. Unfortunately, the amendment was not made in order.

Mrs. WILSON. Would the gentleman agree to seek to include the per-pupil facilities aid program amendment in the conference committee on H.R. 1?

Mr. BOEHNER. As the gentlewoman is aware and the gentleman from Indiana is aware, similar language is in the Senate version of this bill. I will pledge to work with the gentlewoman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Indiana when we get to conference on trying to secure this language in the final version of the bill.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I thank him for his leadership. I look forward to continuing our work together.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico, someone whom I have enjoyed working with on public school choice. I just want to say that as we debate this bipartisan bill over the next several days, we are going to be dealing with issues of reform and accountability and testing. And we are going to be dealing with issues of when children do not do very well, that they have more options to get into new schools and out of failing schools. Certainly this amendment that the gentlewoman and I have worked on expands public school choice, expands options for parents to get into charter schools and magnet schools, and does it earlier than waiting 3 or 4 years for a school to fail. We have put this amendment together. It is a bipartisan amendment on the Senate side with Senator GREGG and Senator CARPER. We hope that this would be accepted in conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy as I mentioned to the gentlewoman, if she will yield further, that we will work together in conference to try to secure this language. I share their commitment to increased public school choice and to the growing movement of charter schools that are providing help for children in very needy communities.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank my colleague from Indiana for his strong work on this and we will continue to work together. I thank the chairman for his leadership as well. I looked forward to working with him.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to serve on the working group representing the minority was a tremendous experience. I must say that going into this, I did not expect to be able to reconcile all the various differences that we held on the majority and the minority side. It took an amazing amount of work on the part of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to put this together. In the process of reconciling many of our differences, one of the salient points that made it possible in my opinion for us to come forward with this bipartisan bill was the assurance that many of the amendments that the Democrats wanted to offer to be included in the major legislation would be given an opportunity to be debated on the floor. With that assurance, we gave up the opportunity for major debate on these items in the committee as we deliberated on the consensus bill. So I cannot begin to describe my huge disappointment that the Committee on Rules did not permit two of the most important Democratic amendments that we have been talking about for years.

Now, this is the world-renowned legislative body that everybody looks to in terms of being able to come to grips with the major issues of our times and to debate them on both sides of the aisle. We are being deprived of that opportunity by this rule which prevents the minority from presenting these two amendments having to do with school construction and class size, the two most important issues that affect almost all of our school districts.

So it is with great disappointment that I come to the floor today, in spite of all the efforts that we made in our committee, to ask the Members of this body to vote down this rule so that we may have the opportunity to offer these two important amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express disappointment that the rule for consideration of H.R. 1 does not permit me to offer an amendment to hire 100,000 additional counselors in our schools.

The amendment would have provided 100,000 resource-based staff for our public schools to help students cope with the stress and anxieties of adolescence. The amendment is similar to H.R. 466, which I introduced on February 6, 2001.

None of us will forget the roster of incidents of school violence. Only yesterday a 14 year old was convicted of second degree murder for killing a middle school teacher. What could make a seemingly typical child turn so violent?

Substantive preventative measures have their place. Security guards, metal detectors, and expelling violent students all have their place in addressing this problem. But they do

nothing to address the child's anger, rage and frustration that leads him or her to commit a violent act.

My amendment would enable schools to work with children to ensure they can handle their anger and emotions without resorting to violence. Many of our children enter school with emotional, physical, and interpersonal barriers to learning. We need more school counselors in our schools, not only to help identify these troubled youths, but to work on developmental skill building. Children do not check their personal and home problems at the schoolhouse door; the problems come in with them.

Suregon General Dr. David Satcher has said that appropriate interventions made during or prior to adolescence can direct young people away from violence toward healthy and constructive lives. The window of opportunity for effective interventions opens early and rarely, if ever, closes. Thus, prevention is the best guard against youth violence.

We have no real infrastructure of support our kids when it comes to mental health services in our schools. The most recent statistics indicate that there are 90,000 guidance counselors for approximately 41.4 million students in our public schools. That translates to 1 counselor for every 513 students. In Hawaii, we have only 1 counselor for every 525 students. In California, there is only 1 counselor for more than 1,000 students.

That is simply not enough. The Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences recommends that there be at least one counselor per 250 students, especially beginning in middle school.

With current counselors responsible for such large numbers of students, they are unable to address the students' personal needs. Instead, their role is more often administrative, scheduling, and job and college counseling. The child is forfeited for different goals.

My amendments would put 100,000 new resource staff in our schools to focus on the mental health needs of students. It authorizes \$2.8 billion for fiscal year 2002. While that may seem a large sum, it is only \$28,000 per counselor.

This resource staff will be hired to address the personal, family, peer level, emotional, and developmental needs of students, enabling them to detect early warning signs of troubled youth. They will improve student interaction and school safety. In a nutshell, they can help save children's lives.

The resource staff can also consult with teachers and parents about student learning, behavior, and emotional problems. They can develop and implement prevention programs and deal with substance abuse. They can set up peer mediation, and they can enhance problem solving in schools. Resource staff will provide important support services to students, and to parents and teachers on behalf of the students.

In addition, my amendment makes counselors eligible for professional development training.

If we really are serious about addressing school violence, we must address prevention and that means having the available personnel to address the mental, emotional and developmental needs of the children.

I regret that the Rules Committee did not permit me to offer this very important amendment.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), also a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I rise in strong support of the rule. Actually I thought we were going to continue that spirit of bipartisanship that we had on the Committee on Education and the Workforce with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). But unfortunately that seems to be dissipated here. I am very unhappy about it and I do not understand it at all, because in my assessment of the rule, it seems as though we have continued that bipartisanship and we have really focused on the issues of genuine concern to all that divided us. I am deeply disappointed to hear that the partisanship that we put aside in the committee deliberations is unfairly raising its head on this rule debate. I believe that we have considered all of the issues that genuinely were the core of the education program and that, in the tradition of our fine democracy, they are included in this rule.

For example, I was one who was against vouchers as part of this bill. I was one in the committee that led the fight against vouchers in this bill. But appropriately, since it is an issue of great interest to a core group of people on both sides of the aisle, it is in the rule and there will be a full and open debate. That is the way this democracy should be working in this House.

Now, there are other issues in the bill, of course; the flexibility in local control. Another point I should make that both in the bill and in the rule, we do put the focus on State and local control, as it should be. We are not going to let the Department of Education as bureaucrats run these schools for our children. But let me also point out, because it is very important to many Members on both sides and it seems to me that it is being misunderstood, and, that is, the question of accountability and results, and that is the accountability. This does not dictate national tests. I know that there are many that are using that against the rule and against the bill. I want to repeat, it does not dictate national tests. The funding is awarded to the States and to the schools, the local schools, for the testing as well as the corrective action.

Then I might finally just allude to my amendment on the mental health counseling which was very well included in the bill. But I guess in conclusion I have to say I am confident that the controversial measures that under this rule and these amendments that will be brought up will be defeated and that we will be consistent with reaching out on a bipartisan basis and supporting the President's vision for education reform, leaving no child behind.

As a member of the Committee I rise in support of the Rule. This is a fair Rule and this has been a fair process. This Rule continues the spirit of bipartisanship we had in the Education Committee. It allows an open debate on the important issues on which we genuinely disagree.

I commend the Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER for their leadership, hard work, and diligence. Also, I thank Congressmen CASTLE, MCKEON, and ISAKSON for their work with key Democrats to form this compromise.

This Rule and this bill are truly examples of bipartisanship. Make no mistake—this was not an easy process. There were many hurdles along the way—and many times we all thought an impasse had been reached. But each time, the sides returned to the negotiating table and found a way to achieve a compromise. No one on either side ever lost sight of the goal—to ensure that every child, regardless of situation, in every public school in America receive a quality education.

This is the way the process is proposed to work—partisan politics have been set aside to make way for a meaningful debate on the issues that matter to America and our children. This process has not been about politics—this process has been about the education of our children. I am deeply disappointed to hear that partisanship is unfairly raising its head on The Rule debate. This Rule deserves to be adopted because it is fair and right for this debate. In the Committee we debated many of these issues. This Rule allows the whole House to genuinely debate the issues in education that in the tradition of our democracy.

For instance, in the Committee we decided against allowing vouchers to be part of this bill. Although I oppose vouchers, I agree with my colleagues that this issue deserves a genuine and legitimate debate by the whole House. This Rule allows the House to work its will. It is not just vouchers. Other issues that divide us, such as testing and accountability, will receive a fair and honest hearing through this Rule. These subjects will be fairly debated under this Rule. All Members, because of this Rule, will have the opportunity to make their case for or against these important issues. In addition to this Rule allowing us to debate the issues, it allows Members from across both sides of the aisle to have their amendments heard. The Rule strikes the appropriate balance by allowing a number of bipartisan amendments.

This Rule focuses debate on the most important and contentious issues of education reform. It is fair, it allows genuine debate, and at the end of the day the will of the House will be heard.

I am pleased that the bill before us today is bipartisan and is reflective of President Bush's vision for education reform.

Specifically: H.R. 1 provides unprecedented flexibility and local control.

It is vitally important to cut federal education regulations and provide more flexibility to states and local school districts. We should give our educators the flexibility to shape federal education programs in ways that work best for our teachers and our children not for bureaucrats at the U.S. Department of Education. Children should be put ahead of federal regulations. Washington does not know

best and Congress should not serve as a national school board. While there indeed is a role for the federal government in education, we must be cautious of the Department of Education becoming a dynasty. I believe that by reversing this trend we will be well on the way to creating the best education system for our children.

Flexibility allows school districts the ability to target federal resources where they are needed the most. This will ensure that state and local officials can meet the unique needs of their students.

H.R. 1 dramatically enhances flexibility for local school districts in two ways: (1) through allowing school districts to transfer a portion of their funds among an assortment of ESEA programs as long as they demonstrate results (2) and through the consolidation of overlapping federal programs.

Very important to many of our members and this President, H.R. 1 enhances accountability and demands results.

As we deregulate federal education programs and provide more flexibility, we must also ensure that federal education programs produce real, accountable results. Too many federal education programs have failed. For example, even though the federal government has spent more than \$120 billion on the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) since its inception in 1965, it is not clear that ESEA has led to higher academic achievement. Federal education programs must contain mechanisms that make it possible for Congress to evaluate whether they work.

This bill provides accountability and demands results through high standards and assessments. And it provides appropriate responses to address failure. States will be required to test students in grades 3–8. It is important to emphasize that the states will develop their own standards and assessments. This bill does not dictate a national test. What the bill does is say that if you are going to accept federal education funding, then you are going to be held accountable for results. We reward states and schools that improve. Those that do not improve will undergo corrective actions.

H.R. 1 ensures that our schools are safe. An important element included here is ensuring that mental health screening and services are made available to young people. In addressing school safety, we must ensure that children with mental health needs are identified early and provided with the services they so desperately need. Many youth who may be headed toward school violence or other tragedies can be helped if we identify their early symptoms. The nation is facing a public crisis in mental health for children and adolescents. While 1 in 10 children and adolescents suffer from mental illness severe enough to cause some level of impairment, fewer than 1 in 5 of these children receive needed treatment.

I am pleased that this bill includes school-based mental health services language in addressing school safety and substance abuse.

While I am confident the controversial measures that would erode bipartisanship and move us away from the President's vision for education reform will be defeated, I am also confident that by the end of this process we will have a solid, strong education package that is good for our nation's children.

I believe in this bill. But these issues deserve full debate and this Rule grants us that

debate. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to vote no on this rule and to give every child the first-rate public education that he or she deserves. I believe, and I think most Members believe, that education is the challenge of our time. And after the early promise of a bipartisan accord on education, before getting sidetracked by a partisan tax cut bill, we are on the floor with probably the first truly bipartisan effort of the Bush administration. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on bringing this truly bipartisan bill to fruition.

This, in our view, is real compromise. It is real bipartisan legislation. It is the product of two sides coming together for the sake of something larger. Democrats did not get everything that we wanted. Republicans did not get everything that they wanted. But both sides were able to forge agreement on more accountability, better-trained teachers, high-quality teachers, and after-school programs which we know make schools safer.

That is why Democrats are deeply disappointed with the rule that the Republicans have put forward today. This rule prevents us from offering amendments that we believe are critical to an excellent public education in the Information Age. It squelches debate on the most important issue that we know, preventing us from bringing two key amendments; to modernize public schools and help get smaller class sizes for our children.

Something clearly happened between the goodwill in committee and bringing this bill to the floor. Instead of building on what was an honest compromise in the committee, the Republican leadership has backed away from the promise of education reform and opening the door to reducing resources for after-school and other critical programs. It has opened the door to undoing school accountability, an issue where the President and all of us on the Democratic side agree. And it is revisiting the flawed voucher scheme that will not turn around failing schools, will leave children behind, and that Members of both parties have rejected.

Now, we need to improve public education for children by building new schools and repairing school buildings, something that both Democrats and Republicans have proposed. By ensuring smaller class sizes, by hiring new teachers, by providing new resources, not less, we live up to the true promise of education reform that truly would leave no child behind.

We believe with all our hearts that bipartisan amendments on building

new schools, on repairing and refurbishing schools and allowing for smaller classroom size would command bipartisan majorities in this House today and next week when we take up this bill.

□ 1315

We ask Members to turn down this rule and give us a rule that will yield a real, real bipartisan education bill for the American people.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, but strongly oppose this bill, reluctantly, after having worked with it for much time and even the last couple of years in committee.

The amendments being offered today are a mixed bag. Some are good and could restore this to a Republican Bush bill, but most likely they are going to be left behind in the leave-no-Democrat-behind bill and it will remain a Kennedy-Miller bill.

This bill, in my opinion, is worse than current law. Most moral concerns that many of us had and worked with were stripped out in compromises. I understood the process, but did not expect it to go so far.

I am disappointed that religious discrimination amendment is not in the bill. I am disappointed that we could not get charitable choice. In fact, that was negotiated out in the Senate and there was no point in coming further on the House floor with it. It was taken out of our bill, which was in it in the past. Every concern of moral Christians that we had in trying to put protections in this bill are gone.

This bill is spending far more money than any conservative can possibly live with. The national testing is a standard that we have fought. The Republicans fought even President Clinton's State standards, yet alone Federal standards.

This bill is unacceptable to Rush Limbaugh, to Dr. Dobson, to over 50 conservative groups in this country. It is unacceptable to Bill Bennett and Chester Finn, who are original people who are doing this. Every major conservative in this country is opposed to it, and some conservatives in Washington need to stand up and say we cannot go there.

I very much respect accountability and the principle of accountability. I am an MBA as well. I believe you need to have measures. I do not believe the problem right now is that there are not tests. I fear one national test, and inevitably this test will control not only public schools and lead to curriculum controlling, it will control home-schoolers and private schools, because once schools become punished by not meeting a standard and the parents have no escape, there will be a manipulation of that standard.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise deeply disappointed with this rule, but strongly supportive of this bipartisan bill.

There is an old saying about partisanship being left at the water's edge with regard to foreign policy. Well, bipartisanship should not be left in the Committee on Rules when we have worked so hard for a bipartisan bill.

We have worked going back to December with meetings that many of us had, Republicans and Democrats alike, with then President-elect Bush in Austin; and we built on that negotiation and that discussion to put a bill together in our committee, working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), and on our side, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), we put education reform and children over bickering and politics.

We have also worked on trying to combine some very important elements, the elements of a fair locally devised test with remediation and resources to help poor children that are not passing some of those tests.

We are going to have some key votes and some key amendments coming up, and I hope that we can keep this bipartisanship together that is so fragile and delicate but so important to convincing the American people that we can do the people's work with common sense, with civility, and good will.

I have great disappointment in this rule, but urge strong support for this bipartisan underlying bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule and urge for its adoption, because the rule allows for a number of amendments that I view to be critical and important.

Our President proposed in this document his education vision for America. He also has proposed in other documents subsequent to his Presidency called Leave No Child Behind a bold education plan which represented an important balance in education reform. That balance included school choice, it included accountability, and it included flexibility.

The school choice provisions of the bill, however, have been ripped out of the legislation at the committee level and they remain outside of that legislation today. That was a painful defeat for the White House and I think for conservatives and for Republicans in

general who believe that provision of the President's bill is essential and is important.

The committee also stripped out of the legislation the language dealing with flexibility known as Straight A's, or, as the President called it in his plan, Charter States. This rule allows for the opportunity for those two provisions in the President's plan to be reconsidered on the floor, and it gives all of us, Mr. Speaker, a chance to restore the President's bill to his original vision.

Absent those two core provisions of the President's plan, there really is very little left of what the President initially proposed in his plan that helped bring him to the Presidency and his plan that he brought to the Congress to leave no child behind.

This rule is important because it makes those rules in order. We have commitments from our own leadership and from our own chairmen with respect to the Straight A's provision, that that will be restored here on the floor before that bill goes on to the conference committee, and those are important elements in restoring the President's vision.

The rule is necessary, and I urge its adoption.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this rule. The President, on a number of occasions, has made it clear that education is supposedly his number one priority, and that is exactly how it should be. What deeply troubles me is the heavy-handed way in which the majority is preventing the full House from debating some of the most crucial elements of this concept.

While ostensibly one of the more important factors for this bill for the President and others is testing, yet this rule allows only one amendment, and that would completely strike a proposed new test. No other amendment on the validity or concept of testing would be allowed if this rule passes, not even one.

If it passes, there will be no real consideration as to whether we provide sufficient resources to schools to administer fairly and comprehensively these tests. There will be no real debate about whether or not this type of testing is even good for our students or, if it is, what is the best way to administer them.

We are going to hear a lot of reasons why it could not be done, and chief amongst them is you allowed us some amendments. Well, 28 out of 158 is hardly enough. You are going to say there is not enough time to do all of this. Well, we are going to be going

home in a little while and we are not coming back tomorrow, so that does not carry any water. The fact of the matter is a good public policy debate is exactly what we need, especially on this bill, and we all ought to be here to engage in it.

One amendment that I would propose would address perhaps the biggest flaw in this debate. The bill dramatically increases the scope and frequency of standardized tests by requiring States to begin testing students each year in grades 3 through 8. That is on top of current requirements. As a result, children will sit for standardized tests by the time they reach the age 9, and in some fourth grade classrooms in fact children still sit three times in a given year.

What clearly is unfair is the anemic funding that this bill proposes. The Congressional Budget Office says it will cost \$650 million each year for States to design, administer, review and revise the tests required by H.R. 1. That is way more than is expressed in this bill, and there is no way of telling how the States intend to make up the difference, other than by depriving other important educational programs.

For this reason I submitted an amendment that would require annual appropriations to reach \$600 million before those provisions could go into effect. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it seems the majority cannot see the millions of students through the trillions in tax cuts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill says a lot. It could say a lot more. I rise today to argue the point that the Members of the Committee on Education and Workforce, at least on our side of the aisle, were told to keep this bill together, we are working cooperatively. When you get to the floor, you are going to have a chance to do what you want to do with amendment. You are going to be able to deal with the class size issue, you are going to be able to deal with school modernization and school construction.

Well, lo and behold, the rule comes down, and no classroom modernization amendment, no class size amendment, are made in order. Overcrowded classrooms, the fact that teachers are required to instruct so many students that children are not getting the attention they deserve, the attention they desperately need, this is a huge issue, a huge issue.

Right now in Michigan, we have some of the most qualified teachers in the country. Ninety-nine percent of our teachers in public secondary schools hold teaching certificates in their main teaching assignment. Forty-eight percent have masters degrees. Yet with all that talent and all that skill, all of that is undermined by the fact that, on average, they have bigger class sizes,

these teachers in my State, bigger class sizes than they do in 44 other States.

Yet under this rule, as I suggested, we are not presented with the opportunity to go forward with the 100,000 teacher program, to put more teachers in our classrooms, reduce that size, get more discipline, more attention to those students.

A lot of folks these days talk about modern classrooms, about connecting the schools with the Internet, and that is critically important and we need to do that. But we also cannot forget that there are literally thousands of schools in this country that are in desperate need of repair; schools with broken plumbing systems, schools that were too hot in the summer and too cold in the winter, schools where children sit in rundown classrooms with broken windows and peeling paint and asbestos hanging from the ceilings. If it is an environment that none of us would choose to live in, how can we say it is an environment where our children should struggle to learn in?

Well, today, Michigan, like on the other issue of class size, we have a very bad statistic with respect to school modernization. We have the sixth highest percentage of school districts in America reporting at least one building in inadequate condition.

So, this rule denies us the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to address those issues. They are primary issues, they are important issues, and I hope my colleagues as a result of that will vote against this rule, and hopefully the committee will go back and make them in order, so at least we can have a debate on these issues and move forward on class size and school modernization and make sure our kids have the kind of place we want them to learn in.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. In negotiations, we were pretty much assured that Democratic amendments would be included on the floor. Good Democratic amendments, such as my amendment to create safe havens at or near schools, and my amendment to bring more females into the high-tech and science workforce, should be part of today's debate, and we should be talking about school construction.

But these ideas were, obviously, inadvertently left out. Instead, Republican amendments that will destroy our bipartisan effort by taking funds from the students and the schools that need them the most are being considered.

This rule definitely fails the fair play test. Let us vote it down. Let us give the whole issue back to the House, so that some day soon we can pass a real bipartisan bill that will debate all of the issues that are important to this

House in general on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the rule considering the No Child Left Behind Act still leaves many children behind. It fails to address national concerns, such as the desperate need to repair and modernize our schools, to reduce class sizes and to hire counselors so that our children learn in the best possible environment.

It treats limited English proficient children unfairly. With one hand the majority tries to court Hispanic voters, but in this bill it places new and undue burdens on Hispanic children.

Democrats have made this bill enormously better, but it is too bad that the Republican budget resolution would not fund many of these initiatives. The majority showed its priorities last week and decided to leave education behind.

The bill has the wrong answer on mandatory testing. At a time when the majority is quick to pass provisions ordering the National Academy of Sciences to study ergonomic standards before implementing rules and the effects of dredging the Hudson River to remove contaminants, it is remarkable that it is going to allow mandatory multiple testing of children from the third to eighth grade without allowing the National Academy of Sciences to study the proposal.

The rule we are considering today does not give us the opportunity to correct those mistakes and improve the bill. The rule shuts the door on initiatives that American people care about, while opening the door to proposals the American people have rejected.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I rise in opposition to the rule.

Let me just give one example of how the promise to have debate on the floor has been broken.

□ 1330

Science education. Science is not just another subject, it is fundamental, like reading and math. For the past year, the National Commission on the Teaching of Math and Science, the so-called John Glenn Commission, met and made a number of recommendations. Some of those recommendations, such as one that would call for a network of national academies, training academies for science teachers around the country, were included in the report, but were not allowed for debate in the committee because, they said, we were told it would be allowed on the floor.

This is critically important. We face a crisis in science and math teaching. The title of our report says it well: before it is too late. Senator Glenn, the

head of Intel, the head of State Farm insurance, a number of other leaders in industry, education and business around the country say that we need these recommendations. We should at least have a debate on them on the floor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise today in opposition to this rule for one particular reason: there are too many children being left behind. Time after time this year I have asked that we finally have a discussion about the Federal Government's underfunding of the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago, the Federal Government made a promise to children with disabilities, their parents, their teachers and their schools, that we would pay 40 percent of the excess cost to local school districts to educate children with disabilities. I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but I grew up in a family where when one made a promise, one kept that promise. Today seemed like the perfect opportunity to have this discussion.

As I did earlier this year in the Committee on the Budget, I proposed an amendment that would have finally made sure the government kept its promise. This time, I was joined by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who is on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I am sad to report that we were denied even the opportunity to bring this amendment to the floor.

Once again, we are sending the message to our students that this legislation leaves no child behind, except for those with disabilities. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her extraordinary leadership on this issue.

I rise today to oppose this rule which eliminated many good amendments that should have been at least debated. For example, I submitted an amendment that would have established a formula grant program to ensure that all States could receive funding to allow them to hire additional school counselors, social workers, and psychologists. At a time when our children are dealing with suicide, substance abuse, school shootings, and other very grown-up problems, these mental health personnel are vital to the health and well-being of our students. The average student-to-counselor ratio is 1,100 to one in my State of California, although the recommended ratio is 250 to 1.

Now, as a trained clinical social worker, I know firsthand how counseling and effective treatment can re-

duce violent behavior. Early detection of troubled youth by mental health counselors prevents school violence. We need mental health school counselors in all of our schools. We need school construction. We need smaller class sizes. We owe this to our children. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am a proud supporter of the underlying bill, H.R. 1. I am glad to see we finally have legislation that recognizes the number one issue, the number one priority of the American people: education improvement in this country.

I am, however, extremely disappointed in the rule. I think it is shameful that the only amendment that was offered dealing with special education in this country, IDEA, is how we can better punish special education students rather than how we can help them.

A couple of days ago I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules with the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) that would allow a debate as to how we can increase funding on special education costs so the Federal Government lives up to our 40 percent cost share. We are only at 15 percent today. If there is one issue that is having a devastating financial impact on local school districts from district to district across the country, it is the inability of the Federal Government to live up to our responsibility, our obligation to fund special-education expenses. Our amendment would have at least allowed a discussion of that in the context of the elementary- and secondary-education bill. Because it was not made in order, I would encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and give us a chance to discuss this important issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this very important issue, the issue of education. I am disappointed that like the collapse of a real energy policy for the American people, we are about to verge on a collapse of this legislation.

I offered two amendments that I thought would be very important to deal with the high degree of suicide and the difficulty that our young people are having today; to provide grants to ensure that we would have local funding and assistance for drug and violence prevention, and also to reduce the risk of children; to identify health risks for our children that play on

playgrounds where there is an exposure to tin, zinc, mercury and lead, that would have helped enhance the educational facilities that we have.

Finally, I think it is very important that we have additional resources for mental health services where there are those kinds of resources in the schools so that there is no stigma, and we can refer the children and their families to therapy and counseling and psychiatric health care.

As well, on this whole issue of testing, can one imagine testing a little 8-year-old all the time, focusing the teacher's resources on testing? We need to reconsider that, and we need more school construction. We could have done a better job on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the support of education for all of our nation's children. I would like to thank and commend the work of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce in their effort to present a bipartisan bill for our consideration.

I am disappointed that the Rule for this bill does not take into consideration several points that I feel should be part of this effort to not leave any child behind. These are real problems with America's schools, but the fault is not isolated to one source, but are multiple in nature. We know that children are acting out a level of rage that challenges our ability to educate our children in a safe and nurturing environment.

The children of our nation are our country's greatest asset and should be the top priority of the Congress and the Administration. The lack of will to make critical and sometimes difficult decisions on children and education issues has damaged the ability of the United States to guarantee that the next generation will achieve a higher standard of living than their parents.

We must make sure that this bill to reform our nations education system truly does not leave any child behind. This bill reauthorizes federal elementary and secondary education programs (including the Title I compensatory education, teacher training and bilingual education programs) for five years (through FY 2006) and includes changes to current laws intended to improve the effectiveness of public schools and hold schools accountable.

The measure reported by the Education and the Workforce Committee has provisions intended to hold public schools accountable for improving the academic achievement of their students. It requires annual testing, flexibility in spending at the local school district level, as well as a new system that would require poorly performing public schools to improve or face consequences, which could include the removal of staff or the transfer of some of their students to other public schools.

As the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have a strong interest in the well being of our nation's children and would like to offer the following amendments for the committee's consideration as it prepares the rule for consideration of this historic legislation.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is the largest public school system in Texas and the seventh largest in the United

States. Our schools are dedicated to giving every student the best possible education through an intensive core curriculum and specialized, challenging instructional and career programs. HISD is working hard to become Houstonian's K-12 school system of choice, constantly improving and refining instruction and management to make them as effective, productive, and economical as possible.

HISD has become a leader in restructuring public education, most recently by establishing unprecedented new standards that every student must meet to earn promotion from one grade to the next. HISD's balanced approach to the teaching of reading has garnered national attention, and Project CLEAR, a comprehensive initiative to align curriculum with fundamental knowledge and skills expected of all students, is contributing to a steady rise in scholastic performance. HISD is bringing its school buildings up to high standards and building 10 new schools through Rebuild 2002, a \$678-million capital improvement program. In addition, HISD opened two new state-of-the-art high schools that were built thanks to the creation of tax increment zones that allow HISD to derive revenue from increases in property value through redevelopment. HISD is demonstrating the utmost managerial accountability through contractual arrangements with specialists in budgeting, purchasing, payroll, personnel management, food services, and maintenance that enable the school district to devote more resources directly to the classroom.

The 18th Congressional District of Houston serves a very diverse group of young people, 52 percent are Hispanic, 34 percent are African American, 10 percent are white, nearly 3 percent are Asian/Pacific Islander, and just under one percent are Native American. The district manages 295 campuses and educational programs: twenty-nine are high schools, 34 are middle schools, 186 are elementary schools, 19 are charter schools, 9 are community-based alternative programs and 18 are combined-level or other programs.

The heart of HISD are its teachers, principals and administrators, librarians, nurses and psychologist, support staff, parents, and board members. I can assure you that the City of Houston is extremely grateful. They have performed outstandingly and deserve special recognition; unfortunately our society does not offer the greatest financial rewards to our most valued citizens—teachers. However, the President's Award for Excellence in Elementary Mathematics and Science Teaching has become an excellent symbol of professional accomplishment as an educator.

In order that we do indeed not leave any child behind, we must first consider that not all children are the same. Their differences should not however, limit their opportunity for a good education in our nation's public schools.

As long as there exist a disparity in funding among school districts within states, and a disparity of education funding K-12 among the states there will continue to be disparities in the education of disadvantaged youth especially taking into consideration the socioeconomic limitations of these communities to augment the educational experience of their children. This must and should be acknowledged by the education reform legislation that we pass and send to the President's desk. We know the realities of education in the United

States are that many children are left behind, not at the discretion of the teacher, school district, parent or child, but under the pressures presented by a lack of adequate funding.

We must fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Act when it comes up for reauthorization next year, but in the mean time there are thousands of children who are denied access to assistance because of the difficult decisions school districts are forced to make in the absence of adequate funding.

Speech and language difficulties affect children of all races in our nation. When a child cannot be understood then their opportunity for a good basic education is greatly diminished.

Because of the lack of funding going into IDEA, children like Jonathan Adam Roumo, who is three year's old Houstonian with a speech delay problem. School districts across our nation struggle with the few dollars provided by the federal government to provide services with children with disabilities.

Jonathan unfortunately is being left behind by the current state of affairs in our nation's education funding. Jonathan is a bright, intelligent little boy who is inquisitive and a challenge to his mother and father because of his interest in everything about his world.

Unfortunately, Jonathan also has difficulty being understood because the muscles along his tongue are too weak and affect how he says words. The tongue is an important organ of speech in human beings and as such is critical to being understood.

The muscles along Jonathan's tongue are at a stage in development that would equate with that of a much younger child, which means that although he has the innate intelligence and stimulation in his environment to speak, his physical ability to be understood is greatly hindered.

Because his parents were concerned about Jonathan's inability to make himself understood, they educated themselves about what was available in the public school system to help Jonathan. They learned about a speech-testing program in their local school district, and saw that Jonathan was tested. Jonathan did well in all areas of the test, which established that he did not need occupational therapy or physical therapy, but he needed speech therapy.

He was enrolled into a speech program in August of 2000 and made excellent progress. Unfortunately, Jonathan's mother was told that he could not go to pre-kindergarten, where he would continue to receive help because he did not have other types of disability associated with his speech limitations. To compound this situation his parents were told that they failed to meet income requirements, which prevent Jonathan's parents from getting him the help that he needs through the public school system.

There are thousands of Jonathans in our public schools who have the potential to do very well, with only a little support in speech development. Under current law Jonathan can receive thirty minutes of speech each week, but that is not enough to make sure that this child is not left behind.

Another serious area which must be addressed is mental health resources available to children and their parents in public school. I have introduced H.R. 73, a bill requiring the Secretary of Education to conduct research on children with dyslexia in the public school sys-

tem throughout our nation. Dyslexia is identifiable and treatable in children at an early age. For this reason, all children kindergarten through third grade must be given tests that measure the following knowledge skills: print; book; phonological awareness, phonics, and writing. These areas have been identified by child psychologist to be key to recognizing learning disabilities in very young children so that they may receive the proper help to insure that they are not left behind.

Further, I would offer that we should rethink what language programs should be used to accomplish. If a child with a speech impediment such as stuttering, lisp, or other delayed speech cannot be understood by a teacher or fellow students, then that child's ability to succeed in the classroom is limited. Today, we consider that child to be disabled and the rules governing the role of schools to provide proper instruction are not uniform. I would offer that if a child cannot be understood that their language barrier be addressed as early and aggressively as possible by removing all economic requirements for that child to get help through the public school system at as early an age as possible. Violence in public schools have cast a chilling shadow through the halls of education in our nation.

The reality of children's lives today are far removed from the experiences of previous generations. They are killing each other and killing themselves at alarming rates.

Currently, there are 13.7 million children in this country with a diagnosable mental health disorder, yet less than 20 percent of these children received the treatment they need. At least one in five children and adolescents has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that can lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide. However, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

The White House and the U.S. Surgeon General have recognized that mental health needs to be a national priority in this nation's debate about comprehensive health care.

Suicide is the eighth leading cause of death in the United States, accounting for more than 1 percent of all deaths.

The National Mental Health Association reports that most people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

According to the 1999 Report of the U.S. Surgeon General, for young people 15-24 years old, suicide is the third leading cause of death behind intentional injury and homicide.

Persons under the age of 25 accounted for 15 percent of all suicides in 1997. Between 1980 and 1997, suicide rates for those 15-19 years old increased 11 percent and for those between the ages of 10-14, the suicide rates increased 99 percent since 1980.

More teenagers died from suicide than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, strokes, influenza and chronic lung disease combined.

Within every 1 hour and 57 minutes, a person under the age of 25 completes suicide.

Black male youth (ages 10-14) have shown the largest increase in suicide rates since 1980 compared to other youth groups by sex and ethnicity, increasing 276 percent.

Almost 12 young people between the ages of 15-24 die every day by suicide.

In a study of gay male and lesbian youth suicide, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found lesbian and gay youth are two to six times more likely to attempt suicide than other youth and account for up to 30 percent of all completed teen suicides.

We must also be prepared and capable of protecting children from other sources of harm that are present in their environment, such as lead, zinc chloride, tin, and mercury.

I appreciate the work done by the Committees to bring this measure before the House for consideration, but I feel that is lacking in a complete and balanced approach to meet the needs of educating all of our nation's children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. The bipartisanship on our committee on this education bill taught us a lesson on how to get along and work in a bipartisan fashion. It is a lesson that the leadership of this House has not learned.

Here is what is wrong with this rule: it is a delicate compromise between the Democrats and the Republicans. There are many Republicans who believe that block grants called Straight A's should be included, and they will have their chance to make that argument on this floor. There are many Republicans who believe that private school vouchers should be included, and they will have their chance to make their argument on this floor. But there are many Democrats who believe that an extension of the class size reduction program ought to be included, and we will not have our chance to make that argument on this floor. There are many of us who believe that a school construction program should be added, and we will not have our chance to make that argument on this floor.

The lesson of bipartisanship that was taught by the committee has been ignored by the House majority leadership. Their rule should be rejected.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule on H.R. 1, No Child Left Behind Act. Because education is such an important issue, I feel that rules must be introduced on the floor so that all people can express their opinions in the general debate. The Committee on Rules only allowed one amendment from the Democratic side, and that is wrong.

I went before the Committee on Rules and asked that my amendment, which would keep the title I monies at a 50 percent level, be included. When title I began, 75 percent of the money

was targeted for poor children. It was the Federal Government saying, we need to assist these schools where there is an imbalance in funding. The imbalance still is there; but it was reduced from 75 percent of poverty to 60 percent of poverty, to 50 percent of poverty, and now it is 40 percent of poverty. On the other hand, some of the people on the other side of the aisle say, we have a 25 percent amendment coming up at you next time.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to leave every child behind. I ask for the rejection of the rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), my distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I would like to urge strong support for this rule. It is a fair rule. It will allow us to vote on amendments which will restore the President's plan.

The President's reform plan for education was a delicately balanced approach, providing more flexibility to the States, a program to empower parents by allowing them to make more choices in their children's education, and holding schools accountable for the results that they would deliver; a delicate balance of saying, we are going to give States more process freedom. We are no longer going to hold them accountable for the process by which they spend their money, but we are going to make sure that every child goes through and achieves the learning that we want. We are going to focus on results accountability.

This rule allows us to have a vote on restoring State flexibility, which was ripped out of the committee mark. It allows us to build on the local flexibility and parental empowerment that are so critical to the President's plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ranking member and the chairman for their commendable efforts at crafting a commonsense, bipartisan education bill. But I am going to ask my colleagues to vote against this rule which brings partisanship and prevents the bringing of commonsense amendments which would improve this bill.

Our efforts at keeping class size reduction as a separate source of funding, maintaining our national priority on bringing smaller class sizes to schools across this country was not permitted to be brought to the floor. Our efforts to bring school construction to the floor in order to be fully debated were not permitted to be brought to the floor. Class size reduction and school construction are two priority issues in American education; and yet we will

not have a chance to discuss these bipartisan, commonsense issues. I regret that very much, and I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), and I know he will use it well.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about accountability, holding students accountable and teachers and schools. There is one entity that is never mentioned, even though States are responsible for the certification of teachers, the setting of curriculums, the entire determination about how schools are going to be provided resources. There is nothing anywhere about trying to get States to be responsible once and for all for the education of poor children.

The Congress, in 1965, 35 years ago, passed the title I law, which we are getting ready to reauthorize, and since then, still, States have failed poor children.

I would hope that we would have a rule that would allow us to seek more accountability. I think there could be consensus between Democrats and Republicans on that point.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), but I must agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) that an America that builds prisons, but not schools, is headed in the wrong direction.

I am asking the Republican leadership to take a good look at the position of the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and when we go to conference, consider putting some construction money in for schools. But I am inclined to support the bill, and I thank the Republican Party for giving consideration to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this rule.

□ 1345

This is a rule for education, yet it is not a very smart rule, because it does not allow us to have the debate and vote on school construction and school modernization.

Mr. Speaker, all of the science tells us that children do better in smaller classes, and indeed, in smaller schools, in some cases. Children are smart. We cannot tell them that education is important to them, that it is about their self-fulfillment, about their way to earn a living and our competitiveness

internationally, and yet send them to schools that are in disrepair, instead of sending them to smaller classes where they will get the attention they need and classrooms which are wired for the future.

Children are smart. They see the contradiction. If education is so important, why then is it not important to the Democrats and to the Republicans, to the Congress of the United States?

That is why I cannot understand for the life of me why an education bill would come to this floor, after all the science this Congress has paid for and told us that children need smaller classes, and this Republican Party will not even allow us the opportunity to debate that amendment on the floor.

I urge our colleagues to vote no on this very unsmart rule on the education bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I am disappointed that the Andrews-Saxton-Maloney-Horn amendment was not made in order.

Our amendment would have provided much-needed Federal grants to organizations so that they can teach today's youth about the Holocaust.

Unfortunately, many schools and communities around the country have not learned about the Holocaust because their schools do not have the funds or tools to each about this tragic event in world history.

There is no question: teaching children about the horror and tragedy of the Holocaust will create a generation of youth in America who are less likely to commit hate crimes, and who are more likely to mature into adults who will envision and work toward peaceful world relations.

This is exactly why the Andrews-Saxton-Maloney-Horn amendment is so important.

We need programs in our schools that teach the consequences of intolerance and hate.

In denying the House a vote on our amendment, the majority is denying our children a chance to learn about one of the most tragic events in history.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), who has been such an integral of this effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is recognized for 2½ minutes to close.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Rules for a fair rule.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), and the members of our committee for a fair and open debate and a bipartisan bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate, if we think about our red or green vote, I want Members to look at what we are really talking about. To

my left is a chart which shows that over the history of funding for public education in Title I, while the gold bars which represent money have gone up astronomically, today, the same as it was 25 years ago, reading proficiency remains at the bottom. It is time for true reform.

On the issue of building schools, they will not tell us that America's unmet need at the local level, and it is their responsibility, is \$300 billion. They also will not tell us that represents 2.5 times more money than has been spent on Title I since it began.

This is not about building buildings, this is about building and changing the lives of America's most disadvantaged children. It has been said that our children are a message we send to a time we shall never see. I am proud we have a committee and I am proud we have a President that has laid it on the line.

When Members get ready to vote red, I want Members to look in the eyes of a disadvantaged poor child in Members' rural or urban districts and ask what kind of message they want to send to a time they will not see.

As a politician, I want Members to think about how much they would respect a President who brings a bill forward with accountability that will allow us to measure our progress within his term of office.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a promise, it is a hope. It is a hope for the future, not of buildings and inanimate objects, but of the sacred treasure of the lives of America's youngest and most disadvantaged children.

The Committee on Rules will allow competitive debate over controversial issues, and in the end I hope Members' green vote on this rule results in a green vote on this bill that leaves no child behind, and sends a message to our future that we would love for our future to see.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization bill. This rule prevents Democrats from offering key education priorities as amendments to the bill—including School Modernization and Class Size Reduction. In addition, I am troubled that an amendment I offered in the Rules Committee to establish a program in the Department of Education to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings was rejected.

The amendment I offered in the Rules Committee—the "High Performance Schools Program"—takes the concept of "whole buildings" and puts it into the context of our schools. My amendment would have established a program in the Department of Education to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings. It would provide block grants to state offices of education that would then be allocated as grants to school districts for building design and technical assistance. These grants would be available to school districts that are faced with rising elementary and secondary school enrollments, that can't afford to make major investments in construction or renovation, and that commit to work with the state agencies to produce school facilities that

incorporate a "high performance" building approach.

We wouldn't dream of putting only manual typewriters in new school buildings—we would install today's computer technology. Nor should we build yesterday's "energy inefficient," non-sustainable, and less effective schools. Our kids are our country's future, and they should have the best school facilities, especially if they will cost less and benefit us all in other ways.

As the Congress begins debate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the important legislation that governs our nation's education priorities, I fear the House Rules Committee has missed a golden opportunity. I am especially disappointed that today—a day when Congress is focused on energy issues because of the release of the administration's energy plan—the Rules Committee chose to overlook this opportunity to take care of our children and our environment at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 201, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Gutknecht
Akin	Culberson	Hansen
Armey	Cunningham	Hart
Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastert
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hastings (WA)
Ballenger	Deal	Hayes
Barr	DeLay	Hayworth
Bartlett	DeMint	Hefley
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bass	Doolittle	Hilleary
Bereuter	Dreier	Hobson
Biggart	Duncan	Hoeksstra
Bilirakis	Dunn	Horn
Blunt	Ehlers	Hostettler
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Houghton
Boehner	Emerson	Hulshof
Bonilla	English	Hutchinson
Bono	Everett	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Isakson
Brown (SC)	Flake	Issa
Bryant	Fletcher	Istook
Burr	Foley	Jenkins
Burton	Fossella	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Callahan	Gallegly	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Gekas	Jones (NC)
Camp	Gibbons	Keller
Cannon	Gilchrest	Kelly
Cantor	Gillmor	Kennedy (MN)
Capito	Gilman	Kerns
Castle	Goode	King (NY)
Chabot	Goodlatte	Kingston
Chambliss	Goss	Kirk
Coble	Graham	Knollenberg
Collins	Granger	Kolbe
Combest	Graves	LaHood
Cooksey	Green (WI)	Largent
Cox	Greenwood	Latham
Crane	Grucci	LaTourette

Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman

Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadeeg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shinkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Ramstad
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Velazquez
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner

Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop
Borski
Brady (PA)
Condit
Cubin

Ganske
Hunter
Kilpatrick
Lucas (OK)
Meeks (NY)

Moran (VA)
Thompson (MS)
Waters

□ 1409

Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOFFFEL and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GREENWOOD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 125, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that there will be no further votes in the House for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Monday, May 21 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, including the following bills:

H.R. 1831, the Small Business Liability Protection Act; and

H.R. 1885, the 245(i) Extension Act of 2001.

A complete list of suspensions will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

On Tuesday through Thursday, the House will consider the following measures:

H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act; and

H.R. 1836, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act Conference Report.

On Friday, the House will not be in session for the start of the Memorial Day district work period.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

If I might inquire further, many Members, of course, have travel plans for next Thursday evening, does the gentleman anticipate any event that would prevent our departing at least by 6 p.m. on Thursday?

Mr. McKEON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we hope to get the

tax conference report back by Thursday so that we can get that passed Thursday, but we do not have a guarantee of that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Of course, the conference has not been convened because the Senate has not acted. Is the gentleman saying in the event the tax reconciliation conference report, if that is not available by Thursday night, we might be facing some interference with the Memorial Day weekend?

Mr. McKEON. Our goal is to finish that up on Thursday, and we cannot guarantee that, but that is our goal.

□ 1415

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, backing up to Monday, does the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) anticipate that there will be any business other than suspensions on Monday evening?

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we may start the general debate on the education bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it had been my understanding that was beginning on Tuesday, but there is a possibility of general debate, not amendments on Monday night?

Mr. McKEON. There would be no education votes, but there is a possibility that we would have the general debate begin.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because there is such interest in the education bill, is the gentleman from California informed as to what days we would be considering the education bill next week?

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, we hope to finish it Tuesday, but it could spill over into Wednesday.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman mentioned both H.R. 1831 and H.R. 1885. Does he know on which days those are most likely to be considered?

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, those will be Monday under suspension and voted on after 6 o'clock.

Mr. DOGGETT. All right, Mr. Speaker. Then on H.R. 1 and H.R. 1836, when might they be considered?

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 will be Tuesday and Wednesday and hopefully H.R. 1836 on Thursday.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 143 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1416

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jones (OK)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loftgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan

Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millerder-Donald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
PHELPS
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, beginning today, we have an opportunity to make a true difference in the lives of our Nation's children, particularly our most disadvantaged children in America. This rare opportunity presents itself in the form of No Child Left Behind, President Bush's plan to improve elementary and secondary education in America.

This process began last December before President Bush technically was even President Bush. It began with a meeting in Austin, Texas when the President-elect invited Members of both parties to discuss education reform, the item at the top of his agenda.

None of us knew what to expect from that meeting, but all of us left with a sense that something extraordinary was within our grasp. It was clear that our new President had a genuine interest in the issue of education. He had a powerful desire to bring Members of all parties together on this issue here in Washington just like he had done in the State of Texas. Now, just under 6 months later, we are here today together to consider the most important change in Federal education policy in 35 years.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked hard on behalf of American students: The gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) on his tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's students and the job that he has done as the subcommittee chairman on the 21st Century Subcommittee on Education Reform.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his leadership and willingness to work in good faith for this bipartisan bill.

The measure before us gives students a chance, parents a choice, and schools a challenge to be the best in the world. After 35 years of spending without accountability, it challenges States to use Federal education dollars to deliver results for our students. Instead of relying on money and red tape, it taps into our Nation's most precious educational resource, parents.

In the hands of caring parents, information is a powerful tool for reforming

our schools. Why ask States to evaluate schools annually? Because parents deserve to know how their child's school stacks up against the others. Why have a report card for States and school districts? Because parents deserve to know whether their children are being taught by qualified teachers and whether their child's school is failing and falling below expectations.

The more parents know, the more they are likely to push for meaningful change in our schools. Without the ability to measure, there is simply no way for parents to know for certain that their children are, in fact, truly learning. There is no way to know for certain which students are in danger of slipping through the cracks.

As Education Secretary Rod Paige has noted, President Bush's education plan rests on 4 pillars: accountability, local control, research-based reform, and expanded parental options.

The legislation before us meets all of the President's principles. It challenges States to set high standards for public schools, demanding accountability for results. It provides unprecedented flexibility to local districts, letting them make spending decisions instead of letting Washington make decisions for them. It triples Federal support for proven reading programs rooted in scientific research. And it provides an escape route for students trapped in chronically failing schools.

These reforms would mark the first time in a generation that Washington has returned a meaningful degree of authority to parents at the expense of the education bureaucracy. It would streamline a significant share of the Federal education regime in one swift stroke. It would provide new hope that the next generation of disadvantaged students can escape the misery of low expectations.

I am grateful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked hard to turn the President's vision for education reform into reality. I believe we have produced a plan that is worthy, not just of the support of my Republican colleagues and my Democrat colleagues and independents, but of teachers, parents, and most of all our children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin my remarks on this legislation by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of my committee, for all of his cooperation and for the honorable manner in which he dealt with every member of our committee, especially those members on our side. We recognize we are in the minority. It makes it very difficult from time to time, but the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was very candid with us, very forthcoming, and I think created an atmosphere in which we could arrive at this work product with this bipartisan conclusion.

I would also say that, as I watched him work, as he assumed the chairmanship of this committee, and as I watched him work with individual members of the committee and to deal with all of the issues that were thrown at us during the months of discussion of this legislation, and during our markup, I saw a legislator at work, and he should be very proud.

I also want to thank those who worked so very hard, the members of our committee as members of the working group: the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

These Members and their staff spent an awful lot of time in sessions trying to iron out the differences between us to see whether or not we could come to agreement. In some cases, we were able to. In other cases, we were not, but we moved on to the other topics and finally arrived in the negotiations that led to this legislation.

I think we feel that, in fact, this legislation truly represents both, what both Members on both sides of the aisle have been saying they want with respect to the Federal role in education and to what the President has said that he wants in this legislation.

I believe that we have an opportunity with this legislation to pass a sound, bipartisan education reform bill that will benefit children. We will have an opportunity to pass a bill that achieves a consensus, a consensus, as I have said, between the education proposals and reform proposals offered by Members of Congress, both parties, and by the President.

Here are the reforms that we want and the overwhelming majority of parents and taxpayers tell us that they want and that we are attempting to achieve in this bill. We are attempting to achieve real accountability for real results; a specific plan to finally, once and for all, close the achievement gap between rich and poor and between minority and nonminority students.

It is very important because this is the intent of the Federal role in education, to equalize the effort and to close the gap between these students with respect to the results and the educational experience.

To provide for quality teachers through professional development, training and resources available to the teachers to do their jobs; significant new investments in our public school system; doubling Title I funding; increase support, respect and training for teachers; new resources to help schools that are failing; better targeting of funds to schools with high concentrations of children in poverty and to children with limited English proficiency; unprecedented flexibility at the local level to tailor education reforms to achieve the ambitious goals that we have set out in this legislation.

Today we have an opportunity to step forward, to make these changes on behalf of our Nation's school children.

This bill is not perfect. There is much more I would like to do to improve education in this country. I know there are many of my colleagues who would like to do some things in this bill differently, but I think this bill in its current form represents a major step forward. I think it would be a mistake for us to miss the opportunity to do the things we are capable of doing now because we cannot do everything right away.

The fact is that, in far too many communities in this country, particularly in our poorest communities, we have what amounts to gross educational malpractice, and that cannot stand. For too long, the educational system in this country has operated under a policy of acceptable losses. Too many children had been written off, and that cannot stand.

Hundreds of thousands of students leave school every year, in many cases with a diploma, only to find out that they have not received a quality education they need and that they ought to be entitled to. That cannot stand.

We know we can do better. Schools all over this country have succeeded in educating students from every background: poor students, black students, Hispanic students, students with limited English proficiency, students that represent American society in so many settings at so many different parts of the country, under so many different circumstances. In fact, they have been given an excellent education with excellent results. All of America's children deserve that.

In virtually every case, they have achieved these successes by doing the very things that we set out to do in this bill, setting high standards, establishing clear goals, and targeting the investments in better teaching and instructional materials.

We are saying today, on the anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*, that this is what we as a Nation want for every child in every school in every State. We want this for the children from Pittsburgh, California to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; for children from Portland, Maine to Portland, Oregon. I hope we can work together to fulfill that promise. We have some important work ahead of us.

The voucher provisions to be offered later in this debate in this bill would kill any chance of bipartisanship. In fact, they would likely result in bipartisan opposition to this entire bill. I know there are differences of opinion, but we believe that vouchers in any form fundamentally undermine what we are trying to accomplish to achieve real education reform throughout this country for all of our students. We will vigorously oppose those amendments.

The other significant amendments that would draw strong Democratic opposition would establish a large block grant with Federal education dollars to

the States, known as Straight A's. We will talk at great length later about what we, and almost every credible group representing local educators, students and parents, think is wrong with that Straight A's proposal.

I would assert here, however, that what we have in H.R. 1 is a better alternative to Straight A's, the provision we call transferability at the local level. In fact, I think the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and I agree. When it comes to the Straight A's proposal, we have a better deal in H.R. 1.

It was not a deal that I came to these negotiations with. It is not a deal that the chairman brought to these negotiations. We both had very different views about how this could be carried out to provide for the flexibility that so many of us have heard in our districts, school districts and administrators have asked for as they deal with the education of the children that they know best.

□ 1430

But out of these negotiations, with great help from the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and others, a solution came forward to provide that kind of flexibility to the local level of school decision-making in each and every one of our States.

We have the opportunity in this legislation, as I have said, to pass a sound bipartisan education reform bill that I believe will benefit all of the children of this Nation, and I look forward over the next few days to work with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and Members on the other side of the aisle, with the members of our committee, and with the Members in the House generally to consider each and every amendment, to give it a fair hearing, and to give it our support or our opposition based on the merits and the differences that some of us have about the direction of the American education system.

As the chairman said when he started his remarks in this debate, as he did when we started our discussions in the committee, this is a debate on the merits of the education system in this country and about those proposals being put forth to reform that system, to hold that system accountable, and to get the results all of us want for all of our children. This is not about a personal political debate; this is not about attacking the motives or the integrity of any Member of Congress. Where we differ, it is on the merits.

To his credit, he kept the debate on that level in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and for that reason we had overwhelming bipartisan support for this legislation, again, that represents the ideas on both sides of the aisle; and I would hope that this is the legislation that would emerge after we go through the markup here in the Committee of the Whole. I look forward to the continuation of the debate next week.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the desperate need to repair America's schools is not a new issue for any of us here today. Five years ago, I conducted a survey of New York City schools and discovered that one in every four schools holds classes in areas such as hallways, gyms, bathrooms, and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard critical building features, such as roofs, walls, and floors. This is an outrage and a disgrace.

In response to that shocking study, I worked with the Administration to author the very first school modernization bill in 1996.

Five years later, with school enrollment skyrocketing, the need to renovate and repair our schools is even more pressing. Yet this problem is simply too big for local and state officials to handle alone. States are doing the best they can but they need federal dollars to fill in the holes. In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization need in America's schools totals over \$300 billion—and that's on top of what school districts and states are already spending!

Simply stated, the need for school modernization is a national problem that demands a national response. And that's why I am so disappointed that the amendment to provide school construction funds was not made in order. Frankly, my colleagues, I think this is an issue where we will pay now, or pay later. We know that students cannot learn when the walls are literally crumbling around them. If we do not provide the resources—even this targeted emergency assistance—we will continue to undermine our students and teachers as they struggle to meet standards and achieve academically.

We can spend this money now, targeted at the most urgent repairs first, providing funding to high-need school districts for critical repairs such as sealing leaky roofs and removing asbestos, or we will pay later—in lower student achievement, ever-more burdened teachers, and potentially even accident or injury in crumbling schoolrooms.

America's children need us to make the right choice now—to use the opportunity we have in this time of unprecedented prosperity to rebuild their schools and lift up the quality of their education. And, if we fail as a Congress—once again—to take action to meet our school modernization needs—we will pay later.

I urge my colleagues to join me to acknowledge the shameful physical condition of our schools and to do something about it. We cannot give our students a 21st century education in 19th century schools.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a couple of minutes to speak in favor of the provision in H.R. 1 that expands and improves the Troops-to-Teachers program. Our military is a great reservoir of potential talent, particularly in the area of math and science, and this program taps into that talent by encouraging members of our Armed Forces to become teachers after they leave the military.

Many have warned of an approaching teacher shortage in this country. According to some estimates, we will have to find somewhere between 1.6 and 2.6 million new teachers merely to replace teachers scheduled to retire. The Troops-to-Teachers program has already been a great help to meet this shortfall, and I believe that it can be ever more useful in the future.

Several thousand members of the military retire each year, often at ages young enough that they are searching for new careers. We want to make it as easy as possible for these men and women to take the leadership skills and character that they have gained during their military careers and try to instill these traits in our young people.

In H.R. 1, we have improved the existing Troops to Teachers program to authorize stipends for soldiers participating in the program, and bonuses for soldiers who agree to teach in a high need school.

We have also expanded the category of soldiers eligible to participate in the program. Under current law, when a soldier completes active duty and decides to be a teacher, he or she has to go through a teacher training program that can take up to a year and a half. Because of this delay, many are discouraged from pursuing a teaching career.

H.R. 1 eliminates this roadblock by expanding eligibility so that an active duty soldier nearing retirement can participate in the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great program that enjoys bipartisan support, and it will bring many more qualified, excellent teachers into the profession that we so desperately need. I applaud its inclusion in H.R. 1 and I trust that in improved version of Troops-to-Teachers will be enacted this year.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Inter-parliamentary Group in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, chairman, appointed on March 20, 2001:

Mr. GILMAN of New York;
Mr. DREIER of California;
Mr. SHAW of Florida;
Mr. STEARNS of Florida;
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota;
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois;
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania; and
Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 21, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS WELCOMING PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI-BIAN OF TAIWAN TO UNITED STATES

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 135) expressing the sense of Congress welcoming President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan to the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 135

Whereas for more than 50 years, a close relationship has existed between the United States and Taiwan, which has been of enormous economic, cultural, and strategic advantage to both countries;

Whereas the United States and Taiwan share common ideals and a vision for the 21st century;

Whereas freedom and democracy are the strongest foundations for peace and prosperity;

Whereas Taiwan has demonstrated an improved record on human rights and a commitment to democratic ideals of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and free and fair elections routinely held in a multiparty system, as evidenced by the March 18, 2000, election of Chen Shui-bian as Taiwan's new president;

Whereas President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan visited the United States on August 13, 2000, when several Members of Congress expressed interest in meeting with President Chen Shui-bian during his layover in Los Angeles, California, en route to Latin America;

Whereas the meeting with President Chen Shui-bian did not take place because of pressure from Washington and Beijing;

Whereas the Congress thereby lost the opportunity to communicate directly with President Chen Shui-bian about developments in the Asia-Pacific region and key elements of the relationship between the United States and Taiwan; and

Whereas the upcoming May 21, 2001, visit to the United States by President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan is another significant opportunity to broaden and strengthen relations between the United States and Taiwan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) warmly welcomes President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan upon his visit to the United States;

(2) requests President Chen Shui-bian to communicate to the people of Taiwan the support of the Congress and of the people of the United States; and

(3) recognizes that the visit of President Chen Shui-bian to the United States is a significant step toward broadening and deepening the friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. SCHAFFER.

This resolution welcomes president Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan to the United States next week. President Chen is stopping in New York on his way to Central and South America. Later, he will visit Houston, Texas.

At the International Relations Committee's request, Mr. SCHAFFER has agreed to make several technical changes, and we are now pleased to waive jurisdiction and support a unanimous consent request that this measure be considered out of order.

This is an important resolution, Mr. Speaker. Taiwan is one of our nation's most important friends in the world. We share the values of democracy, human rights and free markets. President Chen deserves a warm welcome as he comes to New York City and later to Houston, Texas.

Taiwan's democracy and economy have thrived in recent years despite direct threats from the People's Republic of China. We must send a strong message to China that Taiwan and the United States stand together against such intimidation.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this resolution before us, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Congress—

(1) warmly welcomes President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan upon his visit to the United States;

(2) requests President Chen Shui-bian to communicate to the people of Taiwan the support of the Congress and of the people of the United States; and

(3) recognizes that the visit of President Chen Shui-bian to the United States is another significant opportunity to broaden and strengthen the friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan.

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY
MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Amend the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas for more than 50 years, a close relationship has existed between the United States and Taiwan, which has been of enormous economic, cultural, and strategic advantage to both countries;

Whereas the United States and Taiwan share common ideals and a vision for the 21st century;

Whereas freedom and democracy are the strongest foundations for peace and prosperity;

Whereas Taiwan has demonstrated an improved record on human rights and a commitment to democratic ideals of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and free and fair elections routinely held in a multiparty system, as evidenced by the March 18, 2000, election of Chen Shui-bian as Taiwan's new president; and

Whereas the upcoming May 21, 2001, visit to the United States by President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan is another significant opportunity to broaden and strengthen the friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan:

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 135.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORT THE MANNED SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to rise today and speak in support of our Nation's manned space flight program.

Most Americans are aware of the tremendous work that is done on a daily basis by the men and women who work for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Many of the contractors and educators that are involved, and the people who are working in the program today, are some of the same people who have been involved with it for many years or they stand on the shoulders of those who began in the early days of the program, from Mercury to Gemini, Apollo to Sky Lab, the Shuttle program, and now the new International Space Station currently orbiting the Earth today with a crew of three, hopefully someday soon to be able to grow to a crew of six.

The space program, in many ways, has been emblematic in the United States of the technological prowess and our expertise in science; but it is more than that I think for America's culture. I think burning in the heart of every American is the pioneer spirit, the pioneer spirit that settled this Nation, the pioneer spirit that caused many of our ancestors to come to the United States to try to carve out a better way of life. But I really think it is something that burns in the hearts and minds of all human beings everywhere; to explore the unknown or to go to a new place. And while there are many places on this planet we call our home, planet Earth, that remain to be explored, areas like Antarctica and the bottoms of our oceans, truly the realm of outer space is the limitless area of exploration.

In many ways today we are in our first baby steps in these programs, like the space station program, where we are just learning the basics of how to live and do business and to operate in the environment of space. I think it is something that we must do and we must continue to do. I believe that were we, as Americans, to abandon our

space program, to abandon manned space flight would be to turn our back on the very essence of what makes us Americans and our desire to research the unknown and discover new places.

I talk to teachers all over this country; and they tell me over and over again, when they are dealing with their students and they are trying to motivate them and encourage them to study areas of math and science, and I think my colleague from Texas, who was a teacher, will speak later and verify this from his own experience as a teacher, there is nothing that excites our kids more to study in these critical areas of math and science than our space program. This is an area where the United States needs to be doing more.

When I travel around my congressional district, the Space Coast of Florida, the Treasure Coast, I hear over and over again from businessmen, people who are trying to start new companies, that one of the most difficult things they face is to find people who are properly trained in engineering or sciences; that we are just not turning out enough of them. So it is critical that we keep our young people motivated. And the teachers all over America tell us that one of the things that motivates them the most to studying in the realm of the math and science fields is the space program.

They tell me that they can actually take the material that they are being taught in the classroom and apply that to how we go about the process of exploring space and living in space; and, furthermore, that that in turn can help us raise up a new generation of scientists and engineers that will help us to explore the unknown.

Finally, let me additionally say another good reason we need to be in space is just the whole realm of spinoffs. Most Americans are not familiar with the fact that much of the technology involving pacemakers and prosthetic devices, like prosthetic hips, the material science involved in that are direct spinoffs from our space program. Indeed, there is a company in my congressional district that is developing a product that could cause every air-conditioning unit in the United States to run 15 percent more efficiently, which is a direct spinoff from our space program.

I have actually been told if this product proves to be as successful as it is anticipated to be that that improvement in efficiency in the air-conditioning units in homes and businesses all across America would more than save enough money to pay for our entire space program, from its very beginnings from the early days of Mercury right through to the present.

So there is a lot going on in space, there is a lot of future there, and I believe every American supports what our men and women are doing in the space program. I rise today to congratulate all those working in this field and encourage all of my colleagues in the House to continue to

support our manned space flight program.

REAFFIRM COMMITMENT TO SPACE EXPLORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to first compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for the comments he just made, and I want to talk also about space.

Obviously, some of us are significantly dedicated to this issue in this Congress and in this country of ours. The work the gentleman has done and the work I have the honor to be able to participate in is most appreciated, and that has to be infectious and carry over to every Member of this House of Representatives and our Senate to move forward with this.

In starting, I want to talk first about a little girl whose name is Keely Woodruff. She is a little beyond this now, but when she came to me a couple of years ago, at 6 years old, she was having in excess of 50 epileptic seizures a day. This little girl had been to the emergency room so many times that her parents could not even count them. She had the developmental age of about 2½ and did not have much to live for in her life.

Interestingly enough, her doctor found a company in Clear Lake, Texas, in Houston, Texas, called Cyberonics; and Cyberonics had developed and markets today a takeoff on one of those spinoffs from space, a spinoff from a heart pacemaker called a vagus nerve stimulator. This little device was implanted under Keely's skin, with a little wire run up to the vagus nerve in her brain which began to control the impulses in her brain, and it changed her life. She has now set out on normalcy within that life of hers.

□ 1445

What a magnificent thing space did for Keely Woodruff. She had no idea what space even was.

Mr. Speaker, all of that got started 40 years ago when John Kennedy stood here in this room and told this body, "With the approval of this Congress, we have undertaken in the past year a great new effort in outer space. Our aim is not simply to be the first on the moon, any more than Charles Lindbergh's real aim was to be the first in Paris. His aim was to develop the techniques of our own country and other countries in the field of air and the atmosphere, and our objective in making this effort, which we hope will place one of our citizens on the moon is to develop in a new frontier of science, commerce and cooperation, the position of the United States and the Free World. This Nation belongs among the first to explore it, and among the first, if not the first, we shall be."

John Kennedy later challenged this country by saying that we would be

able to send a man to the moon and bring him home safely within 10 years from the time he challenged us. And our country rose magnificently to that challenge, and we created a whole new world in the conveniences that we receive, our ability today to communicate instantly from anywhere we stand around the world, and medical advances that cannot be compared to any other time in our world.

What a magnificent legacy he left us. Today we have satellites that spin above our atmosphere around the Earth. We have the International Space Station that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) spoke of, but today that dream is somewhat clouded.

Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge my colleagues today that it is time for us to change that vision back to what our country shared in the 1960s and the 1970s through the Apollo program, when our commitment budgetarily was 4 percent of the budget to go into space. And my colleagues in the House today, we are doing much more in space than we were doing then, but we are doing it with six-tenths of 1 percent of our budget.

The commitment that we made to change the world is not as strong today as it was 40 years ago. Something is wrong there. We have to change that lack of commitment back into the vision that can make the difference for the little girls that are going to follow, like Keely Woodruff, who might need the advance to save their life. Instead of it being a vagus nerve stimulator, what else might it be able to be to change that life?

If we fail to enact that vision that we planned at the International Space Station, to have seven scientists up there, to have a vehicle that can return them safely if there needs to be, like a crew return vehicle which we have begun to work on, if we fail to make the commitment, even to find the extra \$300 million that we have asked for in this Congress, then something is wrong.

Then that is our challenge, colleagues, and ladies and gentlemen of this country. It is time to reaffirm our commitment and to go forward and see our dream accomplished in space.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SCIENCE IS WHAT SPACE EXPLORATION IS ALL ABOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted this afternoon,

Mr. Speaker, to be able to join my colleagues to remind us of the important challenge that this Nation accepted some 40 years ago when, under the vision of President John F. Kennedy, we said to the world that we would not be the stepchild of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we were courageous enough to stand up and be counted, to value science, space exploration, to challenge the minds of Americans to begin to develop a great love and affection for the disciplines of engineering, math and science. Over the years we have created a new world, a world that has been filled with the excitement of space exploration and new heroes. We can tell by the lines that stood for the movies which captured the essence of what space was all about. We can tell by the stars in the eyes of young children who are delighted after they have visited the various space centers, and I might say particularly the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and myself, and many others, have the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics; but the greatest privilege I have is going back to my district and going to elementary schools and telling a child, "Yes, you can." That is, you can be an astronaut, an engineer. You can emphasize the skills that come about through studying science, and you can be someone.

Mr. Speaker, there are choices that we have to make in this Congress. When I came to Congress from an inner city district, people were watching and wondering: Would she choose housing over space; would she choose education over space? She has to do that.

I was able to turn around the concept of what space exploration and science is all about. It is about all of America. It is about all of our investment. It is about saying to each and every one that there is a return on the investment in science and exploration. There is a return on the investment of knowing how to do the sciences in space, to determine whether we can save lives of those afflicted with diabetes and HIV/AIDS and heart disease and cancer. Out of that came a sense of appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, having the privilege of learning myself and being able to bring to the Space Center people from around the world, I remember hosting the European Union because it was an asset in our community, and being part of the EU and the parliamentary exchange. I insisted that they visit the Space Center, and that was the one of the very special parts of their trip. We took about 40 members of the European Union to Johnson Space Center. How privileged they thought they were. I went with President Rollins of Ghana, who is a pilot. He flew in the simulated spaceship, and began to think about what kind of space exploration could occur in Africa, on the continent of Africa.

I have a more personal note. First of all, I am delighted to be able to salute those constituents that have stayed steady on the forefront, insisting that space exploration and human space shuttle is for everyone. But let me pay tribute to a neighbor and friend, Ron McNair, and I guess it was that time when that tragedy occurred that we began to understand that you do not take space exploration for granted, and that is why I am such a strong advocate for safety and for the dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to joining my colleagues and insisting on an added amount of dollars to ensure that we can do science in space; that the module gets completed, even though we are looking to the Italians; that seven people can be in space; and that, God forbid, we do not even think about an unsafe journey for the men and women who have offered themselves on behalf of this Nation.

This is a tribute to the many men and women and all those who have gone before us, and I am proud to stand here as a member of the Committee on Science and join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) to pay this tribute, but also to say to America, we have choices to make. We are fighting about education dollars, health dollars, but I believe we can invest in America's future by continuing our space exploration and making sure that the dollars are well spent. Less for tax cut, and more for investment. If we do that, we will get the kind of return that we need to have.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with Senate in getting more dollars to ensure that we have the kind of human space flight program, the unmanned program, the science program, the Earth program, and we begin to develop successful stories and successful ventures for this country and this world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BENTSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPREHENSIVE ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to open a discussion on election reform.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as chair of the Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, I stand before Congress today to urge this body to respond to the unrelenting public outcry for comprehensive election reform legislation.

Election reform is an issue that transcends all partisan politics. The right to vote is the very cornerstone of our democracy. Earlier this year I was honored to be appointed by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) House minority leader, to chair the U.S. House of Representatives Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform. I am very pleased to be joined on that committee by a prestigious group of representatives, including the ranking members of the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on the Judiciary. As a matter of fact, many of those on that committee may serve as speakers here today.

The goal of our committee is to ensure the integrity of the election process while increasing voter confidence and participation. While the Florida experience is still fresh in our mind, this committee has begun a thorough review of nationwide voting practices and election laws in an effort to restore the confidence of the American people.

We anticipate that our committee will propose legislation designed to serve our goals, identify key areas where uniform national standards may be appropriate, and make recommendations to Congress on the implementation of changes at the State and local levels.

On April 2, 2001, we held our first hearing in Philadelphia, the cradle of American democracy, and we learned firsthand from Philadelphia voters that when their names were not found on precinct rosters, they were forced to have to travel to police stations to see a judge to determine if they could vote.

Many voters confronted with this form of provisional voting ended up not voting at all, because they were intimi-

dated by the idea of having to go to a police station or because it was just a logistical nightmare.

At our second hearing in San Antonio, Texas on April 20, we heard testimony from registered voter Mrs. Carmen Martinez who was denied her right to vote in the November elections because her name had been erroneously purged from state voter polls. The Texas Secretary of State who also testified explained that Texas' practice of purging voter rolls resulted in 750,000 voters removed from the polls last year. In Texas names are purged from voter rolls as a result of confirmation notices mailed by county registrars which are returned as undeliverable or indicating a return of address.

However, Mrs. Martinez explained that she had never lived at any other address since the day she registered to vote.

On Saturday our committee will travel to Chicago, Illinois, where more ballots were discarded in the last election than in any other major city in the country. A hand-examination of the 123,000 discarded ballots found that the number one reason for the uncounted ballots was faulty ballot punches.

We recognize that in many States they are indeed in the process of approving reforms to their election systems. Most of these reforms relate to modernizing outdated voting equipment and machinery. The committee applauds these efforts to upgrade from punch card or lever voting systems to touch screen or optical scan systems, and we support these reforms.

□ 1500

But technological advances in voting equipment alone will not solve all of the problems of our electoral process. The committee intends to thoroughly examine issues relating to poll worker recruitment and training, national holidays or time off for voting, uniform voting standards, absentee voting, and standardized recount and vote certification procedures. Particular attention needs to be focused on issues relating to voter disenfranchisement, like the purging of voter rolls, voter identification requirements, provisional balloting, voter education, ballot design, sensitivity to poorly educated voters, and voters with disabilities, voting rights and voter intimidation issues. These issues have a disproportionate effect on voters in minority communities. We are monitoring civil rights lawsuits that have been filed in California, Florida, Illinois and St. Louis among others involving many of these issues.

Equally important is the disenfranchisement of overseas military personnel. Congress is uniquely situated to implement uniform standards to ensure that American men and women serving overseas have their voices heard in our elections. Similar reforms must be adopted for other U.S. citizens living abroad. Congress must indeed

take the lead role in restoring voter confidence in our election system and increasing voter participation.

Given the resources available to Congress and the studies being developed by other organizations and commissions, Congress is in the best position to identify key areas where uniform, national standards may very well be appropriate. We need to pass legislation and propose recommendations for changes at the State and local levels to ensure that every vote is indeed counted. As chair of this committee, I will do everything in my power to see that we accomplish these goals on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that just as I and the Members who serve on this committee are concerned about voter reform, we have members in the Senate who are very much concerned and they too are working, holding hearings and putting together legislation. Just this morning, the Congressional Black Caucus met with many members of the United States Senate. At that meeting, we heard from Senator DODD about legislation that he is proposing. We also heard more about the legislation that is being proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). And we know that we have many other Members, even some of the Members who serve on our special committee, such as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and also the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), all who have introduced legislation. So we have many pieces of legislation that are being introduced. I think our committee will be able to examine this legislation and we will be able to give input and recommendation to those who will end up being the final persons who will present legislation, both in this body and in the other body, to come up with legislation that can indeed carry us into election reform.

We are concerned, however. There is no money in the budget for election reform. And we are surprised about that. We had talked at length to representatives of this administration about election reform and we had been told that it was important to the President and that it was important to even the Republican Conference. But we have not been able to get any commitments for the resources that are necessary to help some of these jurisdictions who have little or no money to deal with just the simple problems of replacing punch card systems and getting rid of machines that do not work.

We will continue to try to encourage the President and Members on the other side of the aisle to get involved in this issue, to help us get the resources that we need in order to make reform a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to share with us the important work that she is doing on provisional balloting in the election process.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California not only for yielding but for her steadfast leadership on this very important issue of election reform. As chairperson of the Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, she is working to ensure that citizens across the Nation are aware of the serious effort that is going on to reform our system and guaranteeing that in the future, no eligible voter will ever be turned away again, shut out or discriminated against on election day.

This Saturday, the committee will hold its next hearing in Chicago. Hundreds of voters will have the opportunity to tell us their experiences about how we can improve the system. Chicago, a large part of which I have in my district, had the most error-ridden Presidential election last fall of any major U.S. city, with 123,000 uncounted ballots in Cook County.

That is why the work of this committee is so important. We can learn from voters across the country and from local election officials and experts how we can reform our election system. What the 2000 election has taught us is that many problems exist and that without serious Federal legislative steps, we are destined for another Florida fiasco with the election decided by the judicial branch and not the electorate.

Florida could have happened anywhere. As it turns out, it certainly could have happened in Chicago given all the problems that we had. On election day around the country, voters were turned away from the polling place. They were unfairly targeted. They were not allowed to fully exercise their constitutional right during the election.

This past election taught us a very important lesson. Voters were penalized for no fault of their own. That is why I believe, as I believe the gentlewoman does, that Congress can play a role in reforming current law. One of the ways that it can do it is with provisional voting legislation. It is important that one standard exist nationwide that would guarantee that no registered voter is turned away at the polls.

When we talk about national involvement in elections, which is largely a matter of local jurisdictions, we are not talking about muddling in their business. What we are talking about is setting standards that will guarantee the right of every citizen and the details left to the local jurisdiction. But this provisional voting issue is one where we can play a role in setting the standard. Passing legislation like, for example, my Provisional Voting Rights Act of 2001, H.R. 1004, registered voters can feel confident if their name does not appear on the registration list, they will be permitted to vote. They would not have to go, as they do in some places, we heard in Philadelphia, to a police station, or leaving the polling place in order to get their provisional ballot.

During the committee's hearing in Philadelphia, we heard testimony from Juan Ramos, founder of the Delaware Valley Voter Registration Education Project and Petricio Morales, an ordinary voter, who testified that voters had to travel to the police station to see a judge to determine whether they are eligible to vote. Voters then had to travel all the way back to the polling place to cast their vote. Many voters who are confronted with that process either decide not to vote because they feel intimidated or because of time constraints or just plain inconvenience.

In Cook County, if your name does not appear in the right place, then you are just simply prohibited from voting altogether. You can vote by affidavit under certain limited conditions but there are many instances where even though you may be a registered voter, you cannot vote on election day.

We have to change that. Voters should be given a provisional ballot after affirming their right before an election official right there at the polling place. They can vote immediately and feel confident that if it is certified that day that they are eligible, that that vote will count. If our goal is to ensure that more voter participation occurs, we should take steps to ensure that this is achieved. And reforming provisional voting is a step in that direction.

Actually in the legislation that I have, if they cannot show that this person is not eligible to vote, then the person would be able to vote, exercising their right as a citizen of the United States. I am certain that we will hear more during our committee's hearings in Chicago on Saturday and across the country as the committee continues to highlight the importance of election reform in subsequent hearings. I look forward to that. I once again congratulate my colleague from California on a job well done.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentlewoman from Chicago for all of the work that she has done on election reform. She has been at every meeting. She has traveled with us both to Texas and to Pennsylvania and, of course, she is hosting us in Chicago this weekend. She is giving priority time to this issue. And it is because of the kind of work that she is doing, we are going to be able to help set some standards on issues such as provisional balloting.

Now it is my great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina to deal with the bill and some issues that he has been working with on election reform. I thank him for all of the time and attention that he has given to us as we have tried to put together this committee and gather the information that we need to make the recommendations to this House.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding. I want to underscore what others have

said, that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has done a wonderful job in pulling this committee together and in taking us all over the country to examine voting practices and possible reforms in various communities. I think we are going to have some very significant results in a relatively short period of time.

Everyone in the country, of course, knows about the travesty that occurred in Florida last fall. But what we have learned is that unfortunately, it is not that unusual for people to have their votes not counted accurately, to find that somehow their name has mysteriously dropped off the rolls when they go to vote on election day. There is a range of problems and challenges that we need to deal with to make our democracy work as it needs to work. Certainly the right to vote and to have your vote counted is fundamental to democracy.

My particular focus today is going to be on voting equipment, because we know that we need modern equipment to have votes cast accurately and counted accurately and unfortunately there is a great disparity in this country in the kind of equipment that people are using and the kind of equipment that local communities have access to. All too often, there is a correlation between the worst, worn-out, inaccurate equipment and the economic level of that neighborhood and that precinct and that community.

That simply is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for any community to have worn-out, inaccurate equipment but particularly for it to be concentrated in lower-income areas, minority areas, that is just simply unacceptable. We should not stand for it for another election. Before the 2002 election occurs, we must move on this problem.

It is sort of like the situation we face when we find a neighborhood built on top of a toxic waste dump. How do we respond? We respond to that emergency by buying out those homes to protect the people who live there. When a flood wipes out a community like happened in eastern North Carolina not too long ago, we respond by buying out property to protect the residents and help them find safe places to live.

□ 1515

Well, I think error-prone voting equipment is no less an emergency. It is an emergency that threatens our democracy, and we need an immediate response. And it is going to take some money. It is going to take some money to upgrade voting technology from error-prone punch-card systems to reliable machines. But we cannot afford not to do anything, and here too I think a buyout is warranted, a buyout of these machines, so that new, accurate machines can be in place by the 2002 election.

Just look at what error-prone voting machinery does to our democracy. It is impossible to say every vote counts, when a study done by Caltech and MIT

revealed that the spoilage rate for punch cards from 1988 to 2000 was 2.9 percent, or as many as 986,000 votes in the year 2000 alone.

In Florida last year, the spoilage rate for punch cards was 3.9 percent. In Fulton County, Georgia, the punch-card spoilage rate reached 6.25 percent. In Cook County, Illinois, it was 5 percent during the last election. That amounts to 120,000 ballots.

Now, we have seen some encouraging efforts in cities and counties and States to get rid of this error-prone equipment. In 1996, the City of Detroit used punch-card machines and 3.1 percent of its ballots were spoiled. In 2000, after the city moved to an optical scan system, which warns voters of errors and allows them to correct mistakes, the rate fell to 1.1 percent.

In the States, Georgia recently passed legislation requiring uniform election equipment throughout the State by 2004, and the State is going to conduct a pilot project to test electronic touch screen voting equipment in the 2001 municipal elections.

Maryland passed legislation to require the State Board of Elections to select and certify a new voting system to be used by all counties in the State. And, as we have recently heard, in Florida, the legislature passed sweeping election reform, including \$24 million for new voting systems. Florida has banned punch-card machines, thank goodness, and it requires counties now to use electronic or precinct-based optical scan equipment in the 2002 elections.

Perhaps I ought to point out in discussing the possible avenues for reform that we are not necessarily finding that high-tech is always better. In fact, some of the answers to our problems might be described as low-tech.

For example, these precinct-based optical scan machines which have been turned to in so many areas are not as complex or advanced or certainly as expensive as touch screen machines or proposed Internet voting. But the fundamental question is not how fancy or how expensive or how complicated the machinery is, but rather does it work? Does it enable you to cast your vote in a straightforward way, and does it count that vote accurately? There may be many different technologies that lend themselves to our reform efforts.

The U.S. election system comprises 200,000 polling places, 7,000 jurisdictions, 1.4 million poll workers and 700,000 voting machines, so it is not a simple system and there are not simple solutions. But Congress needs to be an active and constructive partner if we are going to have a successful and meaningful election reform, and there is no better time to act than now.

There are several proposals in the Congress to help States and counties and cities get the technology they need to run accurate elections. A bill I introduced with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN)

would make grants available to any jurisdiction that used a punch-card voting system in the last election. We want to see them get new equipment in place by 2002, and we are going to push for Federal funding to make that buyout happen, to get those inaccurate, worn-out machines off line and bring on more accurate systems.

I am disappointed that the President and our Republican friends have failed to include one dollar for election reform in their budget, but that must not stop us. This Congress must meet the challenge of restoring faith in our democracy.

I thank my colleague from California for her leadership in making this happen, and I pledge my continued support, my continued work, to make meaningful election reform a front-burner item before even the first session of this Congress goes home.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for all of the time and attention he has given to the efforts of this committee. It is because of his diligent work and his efforts that we are going to be successful in helping to reform the election systems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California and join everyone that preceded me in praise of her efforts and the leadership that she has demonstrated in making sure that this committee meets its charge.

Mr. Speaker, if one thinks in terms of the greatest and most precious right that any American citizen would have, and that is the right to vote, it is the great equalizer. One vote counts just as much as any other. The vote of the President of the United States is no more important and is given no more weight than the vote of someone who is 18 years old and happens to be a senior in high school and casting their vote for the first time. It empowers us. It empowers the people of the greatest democracy known in all of history, and therein lies our problem, and that is the exercise of that right.

Now, we all know that we have laws at the State and Federal level that protect the right to vote. It guarantees the right to vote. We have the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court of the land, that, again, will guarantee us the right to vote. But it is only guaranteeing the right to vote.

What thwarts, what frustrates, what impedes the citizen's right to vote, regardless of the constitutional guarantee or the laws that we have on the books? Well, believe it or not, it is something as simple as a machine that malfunctions, something a little more complicated by not keeping an accurate voter list.

In the past though, and this is so important, and I think we are forgetting the lessons that history should have taught us, when I was growing up in

the State of Texas the greatest evil to the right to vote was the poll tax. It kept people from being able to exercise that precious right. The poll tax at one time was about \$1. It went up to about \$2. My father, who served in this Chamber for 37 years, the first bill he introduced upon being sworn in was to abolish the poll tax, and eventually it was.

But then there was something else, literacy tests. Anything that could keep the citizens of the United States from exercising their right to vote.

Well, we have made great progress. We do not have literacy tests any more, we do not have the poll tax any more. But what comes in its place today? Either through intention or through neglect, other things are now posing as great a risk to the disenfranchisement of the citizens as in the past, where once, because of gender or color, people were denied the right to vote, and once, because they did not have the amount of dollars to pay for the poll tax or could not pass some made up literacy test, were denied the right to vote. That was a travesty, as I said, and we corrected it.

But we are back there. That is the tragedy of what was demonstrated in Florida, is that we may still be there. It is more subtle. Like I said, maybe it is by some intentional act, or it could be simply by negligence.

What do I mean by that? Well, today we have voting equipment that simply does not work. I mean, it simply does not work. It does not do its intended job.

We have inaccurate voter lists, so that when people go to vote, they are not on the list and they are denied the right to vote, even though they truly are registered. Because of some mistake, lack of funds, technology, they are just not on the list.

Confusing ballot design. There are many. I will tell you right now, if you look at certain ballots, you will be confused. I know that when I go to vote, I assume it is going to be somewhat of a simple ballot. I hate to admit, but in a recent City Council election in San Antonio, when I went to vote earlier, I looked at that thing and I was too embarrassed to ask for instructions. A lot of people feel that way. I think I was more embarrassed than the average citizen, because I am a Member of Congress. But the point is, if I felt somewhat intimidated, if I was confused, think of the average citizen going to the polling place.

In Texas, we do have provisional ballots in voting. If your name is not on the list, you might be able to swear, if you have an educated, trained, skilled poll worker that knows the law. However, that is denied many voters, because we do not have trained and educated poll workers. They are not paid enough, they are not trained, they are not educated in the election law, that which they are there to administer.

It sounds outrageous, but there is no one right now that can hear my voice, no matter where you live, that is not

experiencing this problem. You just do not know about it. You have not looked into it.

That is what this committee is doing. We are going throughout the United States and holding hearings in different locations, Philadelphia, San Antonio; it will be Chicago next. And what are we learning? We are learning quite a bit.

I will tell you what I learned in San Antonio, my own backyard. We have the problems as Florida. We have overvotes. We never knew that they were invalidating individuals' votes until we looked at it in the context of the Florida experience. And then I have got my election officials saying, well, Congressman, this is nothing new. We always have these votes. We just toss them out. They do not count.

See, you have to ask yourself, why do we have these? It might be ballot design or the equipment itself, improper instruction, the lack of voter education. Again, the polling worker in San Antonio, I found out in a city where you have more than 60 percent Hispanic population that we did not have bilingual poll workers in many of those parts of the community, where it is not 60 percent Hispanic, it is 85 and 90 percent Hispanic. So it is my own backyard. And I am willing to admit to it, that out of ignorance, I never got involved. Out of ignorance, I never did anything.

The tragedy of Florida is not what happened in Florida. In and of itself, it is a tragedy. The real tragedy is if we do not learn a lesson and do something.

So this committee is going to do something. We are going to identify the problems. We are going to make recommendations. We will come up with legislation that will address many of these problems.

But do not get us wrong. Part of our job is to be a clearinghouse for not just the problems, but for the ideas and the solutions and the remedies. And we will look to the States and the local authorities to come up with their own solutions, those that custom fit their particular problem. We want to give the States and the localities that opportunity, because that is what we do here in Congress.

We do not want a Federal fix for every problem. However, if action is not taken that addresses the inequities and the injustices of people not being able to vote, then it is our duty, as Federal officials, to step in and not only give direction, but basically do it on our own.

I do not think it will come to that. I think we will make certain suggestions. Many States and localities are already incorporating and enacting laws. If there is a shortcoming, we will say, how can we help?

You have already heard one of my colleagues. We have legislation, it has already been introduced, about assisting localities in the purchase of the latest technology, which is really important. But they will make the deci-

sion on what best suits their situation. But we are there to help.

It is so important. I guess there is no way to explain it. How can we guarantee the right to vote to the citizen? How can we teach the children in our classrooms how great our country is, and then we say, voter participation is decreasing. Get out there and vote. Every year, every election, I am out there with some sort of public service announcement, begging my constituents to please get out there, to register and vote.

Now they are going to take me up on that. They go and attempt to exercise that right, and they are not able to. Therein lies the real problem. I do not think the problem is that we do not have enough laws guaranteeing the right, we just do not have the mechanism to translate the right into reality, and that is our charge.

Madam Chairman, I think I am going to end where I started. I am going to thank you for the leadership you provided us. It is a great honor to serve on this committee, and I think many, many people are going to be quite impressed with the end product.

We have heard that this is not an issue that is way at the top of the list as far as the American public or the United States Congress is concerned, and that is wrong, because then what we have done is we have compounded the tragedy of Florida. We did not learn a lesson, we did not make a situation better, we did not cure a problem.

□ 1530

Should we fail to do that, I think we have failed in our duty and responsibility; but more importantly, we have failed the American people. They have a right to vote, but they also have a right to make sure that that vote is counted. What good is a right if one cannot exercise it.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas, not only for his participation here today, but for his participation on this very special committee. He has been at every meeting, and I want my colleagues to know that he rolled out the red carpet for us in San Antonio where we had an excellent hearing and we learned an awful lot about purging and had testimony from Mrs. Carmen Martinez, who told us about what happened to her there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland as much time as he may consume. While the gentleman is coming to the microphone, I would like to say that we are so happy to have him on this committee. He has contributed tremendously to our work already; not only has he been involved with us as we have traveled, but he has been to all of the meetings that we hold every Tuesday, and he has been working very hard, trying to bridge the gap between this side of the aisle and that side of

the aisle, to come up with legislation that will move us forward in reform. I thank the gentleman so very much for all that he has done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I want to also thank her for the extraordinary efforts that she is making to ensure that not only will in America every citizen have the right to vote and be welcomed and encouraged in exercising that right, but will also have his vote counted correctly.

When the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), was discussing who should chair a committee that would look at election reforms, the problems that were brought to light in the last election, we had some discussions. He suggested the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the reason he did so is because he knew and I knew and her colleagues knew that the gentlewoman is one of the strongest, most courageous voices that we have on this floor, a voice much like the voice of the gentleman from Texas's father who, in his time, was a giant in speaking out for those who were disenfranchised by operation of law. No less should we speak out for those who might be disenfranchised by either negligence or the misoperation of technology.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, for her hard work on this effort; and I am confident that we are going to pass legislation in this Congress. This is the civil rights issue of the 107th Congress. There is no more basic right in democracy than the right to vote. When we do pass legislation, it will be largely attributable to her hard work and efforts in making sure that everybody in the Nation is focused on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes on one element that is key to reform: better voting technologies, the nuts and bolts of the election infrastructure. Now, as I begin this, I want to make it again clear that the technology issue comes in only after we have ensured and facilitated a voter getting to the technology. If the voter never gets to the technology, it is irrelevant.

So the most important thing we need to make sure of is that every voter is able to register; that they have their registration accurately recorded; that it is transmitted accurately to a polling place; that the election officials receive the voter and accurately check to make sure that voter is registered; and that there is, if there is a failure to communicate from the recipient of the registration and the polling place, a way in which a provisional ballot can be cast, so that that voter is not turned away, is not told no, your democracy is not open to you today, not because of your failure, but because we failed to transmit information properly. So what we are going to do is allow you to vote and then we will take a day or two to make sure that you, as you have said, were registered to vote and a legal voter.

None of us on this floor wants to facilitate voting by people who are not eligible to vote. But equally, I hope, there is nobody on this floor who wants to prevent an eligible voter from casting a vote. We found in Florida that people who got to the polls voted, thought they had voted correctly, left, and found that, lo and behold, their votes were not counted. We further found that this was not a Florida problem. It was Florida that we focused on, it was Florida that we learned from, but we quickly were informed by others around the country that it was not a Florida problem.

It was a problem in jurisdictions north, east, south and west, in Maryland, in California, in Texas, and New Jersey, the four jurisdictions represented on the floor right now. So we focused on the fact that we need to make sure that that voter, when they exercise their franchise, has it counted and has it counted accurately. Better voting technology is the nuts and bolts of election infrastructure.

When I say nuts and bolts, I mean that quite literally. Over the past 2 days, the Committee on House Administration, of which I am the ranking Democratic member, has learned from the manufacturers that actually build the sophisticated, durable equipment that Americans use to exercise their right of franchise, equipment used not only by Americans, by the way, but voters all over the world, many of whom have struggled to attain the right to vote and will retain it only if their nations' democracies are conducted honestly. While we have a long history and are not at risk, we are at risk of retaining the confidence of our people that their votes will be accurately counted when their voices are raised to participate in democracy.

For that reason, it is not an exaggeration, I think, to say that the voting machine manufacturers build the tools that make democracies all over the world live up to their names. They produce what I will call the "voting veins of democracy." And how well those veins carry votes forward to an accurate count can be the difference between a democracy whose heart pumps strongly and faithfully and a system that does not enjoy the confidence of its citizens.

Over the past 2 days, 13 vendors have displayed the newest technology available in the voting machine industry in the Committee on House Administration room. Members of Congress, their staffs, the media, and the general public have had the opportunity to test the machines and to ask questions. I saw the full range of what the voting technology industry is developing, including Optiscan equipment and Direct Read Equipment, so-called DRE, computer touch-screen equipment. I also learned and other Members and staff learned about sophisticated software and hardware to ensure that voting is accessible to all Americans, and "all" needs to be underlined, that votes are

counted accurately and completely, and that voters have a chance to correct mismarked ballots before they are cast.

That is so critically important, Madam Speaker, as the gentlewoman well knows. What we have found is a system that counts at the precinct level is much more accurate than a system that counts at a central location after the voter has left, where there is no opportunity to tell the voter, you forgot to vote, you over-voted, you made a mistake, do you want to try to correct your ballot. People make mistakes, but we should not subject them to the vagaries of the possibility of making a mistake when we have technology that can say to them, either you did not vote for President, do you want to; you do not have to, we are not forcing you to, but do you want to? Did you forget this? Or, hey, you voted for two people for President and that will not be counted. Do you want to correct it? Give them that opportunity so they can ensure the fact that they have exercised their franchise correctly.

We also learned about sophisticated software and hardware devices to ensure that voting is accessible to those with disabilities, to those who are even quadriplegic and cannot use hands or feet, to those who are blind, to those who have other impairments. We can fully make accessible the voting system to them and provide for the secrecy of their ballot as well. That technology is available. We need to pursue it.

What I did not see on display, I am happy to say, is the latest in punch card technology. Why? Because almost everybody has concluded that punch cards have seen their day and ought to be on their way. The fact of the matter is, Florida, with only two dissenting votes, has mandated the abolition of the use of punch cards in their State. Only two dissenting votes, unanimous in the Senate and two in the House. They came up with money, and the President's brother, Governor Jeb Bush, signed the bill and they are proceeding to do that. I am hopeful that President Bush will follow the lead of his brother, Governor Bush, and help us take that same path.

Any industry operating at the cutting edge can teach us a lot about the future of technology. What I have learned from the voting technology industry in the past 2 days is that there is no future for that punch card. Inventors may yet devise a better mouse-trap. What they will not devise, however, is a better punch card.

The punch card will soon be obsolete. I look forward to the day when it will be on display downtown in the Smithsonian and not in the voting precinct. We may talk about those days between November 8 and December 12 when we were mesmerized by the 537 votes, or the 219 votes, or the five votes that would make a difference in counting these punch cards, and whether or not

they would make a difference in Florida's electoral votes. We are beyond that, and it is not the purpose of anybody on this floor to look back. It is, however, to learn from that history and not see it repeated.

I have also learned that taking advantage of the latest, most reliable and accessible technology represented in that room, in the Committee on House Administration room, that voting technology will not be cheap. Now, relatively speaking, in my opinion, it will not be extraordinarily expensive either, and it is worth the price. But the average DRE machine runs about \$4,500. That is a touch-screen machine or some other computer technology. The average Optiscan technology where one fills out the ballot as if one is taking a test, and take a number 2 pencil or something else and connect the dots, or connect the line, and then put it into the counting machine and have it scanned optically, from which it gets its name. If you have not voted correctly, if you have overvoted, it simply kicks it out, and says, you have made a mistake, you get it back and you can correct it. But that costs about \$5,000 to \$6,000.

While communities should be expected to help pay for much of the cost of these machines, we in Congress have an obligation to foot the bill. For over 200 years, States and localities have been conducting elections, and during those 200-plus years, they have had Federal officials running on their ballots, and they have paid the full price. We, in effect, have gotten a free lunch. It is appropriate that we at the Federal level, as State and local governments do, participate in partnership in ensuring the accurate, accessible elections of our officials. After all, we in Congress are elected on the machines that are now in use, including the punch card devices that were used in 72,000 of the 200,000 voting precincts last year.

We in Congress will be elected on the new machines that start entering service in the months ahead, I hope by 2002. It is therefore, Madam Speaker, appropriate that we help with guidelines and encouragement to local subdivisions to run these elections as best they possibly can, in this, probably the most technologically proficient Nation on the face of the Earth. Surely, surely, we can, we must. It is our sacred obligation to ensure that this Nation, a beacon of democracy for all the world, is as good a democracy as the world thinks it is and as we know it to be.

□ 1545

I might say, I also look forward to joining the gentlewoman on Saturday when we go to Chicago where we will hear from voters and those who administer elections as to how best we can make the system work.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from Maryland so very much for all of the work that he has put into this issue

of election reform. I thank him for the attention he has paid to the committee, and I thank him for the work that he is doing to come up with legislation dealing with this technology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Maryland to join me as we close out in a colloquy just reinforcing how important this issue is.

I would just like to say to the gentleman from Texas, I was listening to him as he talked about the work of his father, a man that I loved dearly and paid a lot of attention to, and hope to follow in his footsteps, by the way.

I thought about the work that I have done here, the issues I have been involved in: women's issues, women's health issues, criminal justice issues, AIDS issues, foreign affairs issues, et cetera. But I think that this work that we are doing on election reform may be the most important work that I will do in my entire career here in the Congress of the United States.

Do Members feel that this work holds that kind of priority, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, said it, that it really is almost a sacred duty because it is a sacred trust. Nothing rises to the level of the importance of this issue.

People sometimes think we are given to hyperbole and exaggeration, but we really are talking about the fundamentals of a democracy, the absolute right of the public to be masters of their own destiny. It is the right to vote.

Again, this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. That is the beauty of it, too. It transcends party lines, philosophies, everything; station in left. This is basically the common thread, more or less, that our citizenry really holds in common.

So I agree with the gentlewoman, I do not think there is going to be anything more important that I will ever work on. I am the lucky one. I have only been here 3 years. I am lucky to have this opportunity.

But truly in relation to all the wonderful leaders who have preceded us, and we are thinking about the Civil Rights Act and so on, what we are talking about is really giving life to those laws, and life and meaning to the Constitution. So we are privileged, but by the same token, I think it is a tremendous responsibility. We cannot fail.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as I work with the committee members and as I listen to all that has been said here today, and as I stand here as an African American woman, and to my right I have a gentleman representing Texas of Hispanic descent, and I have here on my left the gentleman from Maryland, a Caucasian gentleman, we are really the rainbow of America on this issue.

I think that all Americans, no matter where we are in this country, no matter what our backgrounds are, all Americans care about this cornerstone of democracy.

Would the gentleman say this is a very central issue?

Mr. HOYER. I think the gentlewoman is absolutely right. The polls reflect that. The polls reflect overwhelmingly that Americans expect us to fix the problem of which they were made aware last November and December.

They were shocked to learn that many absentee ballots and overseas ballots were never counted in the course of running the elections. It was just expected by election officials if they were not going to make a difference, they would not be counted. I was chagrined. I may not have been shocked, but I was certainly chagrined to hear that.

I am a white male, who from the very start of this nation everybody presumed would vote. Margaret Brent was the first woman lawyer. She came from Maryland. She was on the Governor's Council. Governor Calvert died, and she asked for a vote. She was denied that vote.

It is incredible to me that we have had to amend the Constitution on a number of occasions in this connection. Thomas Jefferson intoned words that all of us recite, that all men, presumably but not necessarily meaning women as well, were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Clearly it was the concept of so many of us that that meant all of us, but clearly, it did not mean all of us. It was not until a great civil war and the Thirteenth Amendment that we ensured that, at least legally, African Americans could not be discriminated against.

But we know as a result of poll taxes and literacy tests and the imposition of devices to intimidate people from registering and coming to vote that that was honored more in the breach than it was in the adherence.

We know that immigrants, nonwhite Caucasian Americans, had difficulty, for which the father of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) was a giant in saying, that is not right.

We did not add women, and an African American woman, or African Americans, men at least, could vote before women could vote. It was incredible that in the enlightened democracy of America in 1914 and 1918 women could not vote. We had to pass a constitutional amendment which said that we are not going to discriminate on the basis of gender.

It was not until 1965, as the gentlewoman knows, when we passed the Voting Rights Act that we said, we cannot have poll taxes, we cannot have literacy taxes, we cannot preclude, and the Federal government is going to step in and ensure that every American has access to the polling place? Why? Because it is central.

Then we had another constitutional amendment and said that if one is old enough to go overseas and fight to defend democracy, one is old enough to

vote at 18. We amended the Constitution again. So this has been an ongoing process of ensuring that our democracy is participated in by every citizen, not just a select few.

This effort is about that objective. Again, I think the gentlewoman is correct, it is a critically important objective.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for participating with me today. They have both stated so clearly and in so many ways that something is wrong with the system and we perhaps fell asleep at the wheel, and we allowed the infrastructure to kind of fall apart.

Many of us thought with the 1965 Voting Rights Act that we had gotten rid of all of the problems. Little did we know that we would reach a time when we could not recruit polling place workers. Little did we know that we would have a system that did not train them so they would know what to do when a provisional ballot was needed. Little did we ever dream that we would find ourselves at a time when there is a polling place with almost 100 percent Latino voters and no one to do translation, or to make sure that they have access to that vote and to that ballot.

I want Members to know how proud I am to serve here in the Congress of the United States, and to serve with Members who care so much that they make this their priority work.

I want Members to know how proud I am to be able to do the kind of work my ancestors would certainly have me do, and I am so proud that I have been given this opportunity, and that the people who have joined with me appointed to this committee are working very hard.

Yes, we have been to Texas, we have been to Pennsylvania, and we are on our way to Chicago, a place that really does need us. It has needed us for a long time. We are on our way there to find out what we can do to strengthen the system. But we will be going to many other places.

Let me conclude by saying, as a Californian, a suit has been filed in California by the ACLU because, as sophisticated as we are supposed to be, guess what, we rank right up there with some of the other States like Illinois where votes are thrown out, not counted, because of overvoting and other problems in the system.

So hopefully both Members will be able to join me in California as we take a look at this suit and see what we can do.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am committed to building on the success of growing Latino voter turnout by working with my colleagues to achieve meaningful election reform before the 2002 elections.

The 2000 presidential election has brought long overdue attention to the need to overhaul our country's election procedures and provide resources that will ensure we have accurate elections. Central to these efforts must be the protection of each citizen's ability to freely exercise his or her right to vote.

Throughout our nation's history, expansion of the right to vote has been a struggle, and it is a struggle that continues to this day. The glare of media coverage, caused by the closest presidential election of our time, exposed voting irregularities that have long been ignored all across the country, not just in Florida.

Numerous legislative proposals have been introduced in this Congress to address election reform, and I believe it is encouraging to see that so many members are making this a priority. While there are about a dozen different bills, they also share many similarities. It is clear that based on the proposals we have seen so far, we need to move toward establishing a new elections body that will be charged with distributing grants to local election authorities for modernizing voting procedures and providing incentives to voting machine manufacturers to improve their equipment and invest in research and development.

In order to gain useful knowledge necessary for the effective modernization of our voting system, a study will need to be conducted of voting irregularities in the 2000 election and of flaws in our voting system in general.

As we chart our way through these various reforms, which coincide with another upcoming round of redistricting, the significance of minority representation is going to be greater than ever. Where necessary, we must be prepared to reaffirm support for, and strengthen, the provisions of the Voting Rights Act and National Voter Registration Act that protect minority representation and bilingual elections services.

The problems facing the integrity of our elections fall into two broad categories: (1) logistical challenges, and (2) barriers to voter turnout.

There are three main logistical problems prevalent in the process of running elections. First, local election boards are typically underfunded. As a result, counties are unable to replace antiquated voting machines. The punch-card ballots made infamous by the Florida recount are used by about one third of voters. Replacing them all with a more reliable system will be a costly, though certainly worthwhile investment.

Second, there is a shortage of adequately trained staff to respond in a timely and professional manner to voters' questions about absentee voting, their registration status, polling place locations and other concerns. On election day itself, many polling places open late, are not open long enough or lack polling place workers who are adequately trained, further causing delays, confusion and the disenfranchisement of voters. In particular, there is a lack of bilingual staff who are able to help voters who face a language barrier at the polls.

Third, polling place access is an extremely important logistical issue, and is not always directly related to funding. Every polling place should be easily accessible and in safe, familiar locations that are easy for residents to find.

The most troubling obstacle to fair elections is voter suppression, which is aimed almost exclusively at minorities. Unfortunately, such tactics are prevalent across the country and not only targeted against African-American voters. The practice of placing so-called security guards, or volunteers in clothing that resemble uniforms, at polling places has been used to intimidate Latino voters in past elections. The use of misleading radio broadcasts

or other means to confuse minority voters about their polling place location is another tactic employed to keep down minority turnout. First-time voters, such as newly naturalized citizens, many of whom are Latino, are particularly susceptible to confusion about the voting process, especially because relatively less, if any, election information is provided in Spanish.

In response, state and county governments must be spurred to pro-actively prevent voter suppression in heavily minority precincts. To ensure smoother elections, there needs to be greater investment and attention in such precincts to ensure appropriate staffing levels and training, equipment, polling place site selection, and education campaigns.

We will need to consider ways of enhancing the enforcement of existing laws that punish voter intimidation and implement new or stronger penalties where necessary. We should also consider expanding the scope of such efforts to include more passive forms of voter suppression, such as the withholding of assistance and information to voters might prevent them from voting. For example, there have been many accounts of polling place workers refusing to allow voters the right to a provisional ballot, a right that was expanded under the 1993 National Voter Registration Act.

A final obstacle to voter turnout relates to the maintenance of voter registration rolls, which must be considerably improved. Latino voters have experienced problems with getting on the rolls in the first place and then later being purged from them. The problem with getting on the rolls is related to problems with voter registration. Voter registration forms have been rejected for arbitrary reasons, such as being filled out with the wrong color ink, and during the most recent election, there were reports from Florida of Latinos who had registered but whose names did not appear on the rolls and were therefore barred from voting.

The other side of the voter roll problem is when legitimate names are purged. In a number of states, voters are purged from the voter rolls if they do not vote in every presidential election or a set number of elections within a certain amount of time. Requiring voters to re-register if they happen to miss an election, or else risk being ineligible to vote in a subsequent election, is just another barrier to voting.

I will be working with my colleagues in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to press for increased funding of election boards; promote voter participation through national legislative and educational efforts; and monitor existing voter protections, especially the 1975 and 1992 amendments to the Voting Rights Act which protect language minority groups and require bilingual services.

Voting is a hard-won right that should not be a struggle for minorities in every election. In addition to empowering minority citizens about their rights as voters, we can also make considerable progress toward improving the way we run and monitor elections, making them as easy and convenient for minority voters as they already are in so many affluent and predominantly white precincts. In the Latino community, we often say *su voto es su voz*—your vote is your voice. We must ensure that we take the necessary steps to ensure that the voices of all voters are heard.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because we must continue to address

the overwhelming evidence of grave voting irregularities and voting rights violations in the recent presidential election in what was the closest and most contested presidential election in the history of our great nation.

It is imperative that Congress continues to engage in a serious review and comprehensive reform of our election process in this nation. The disenfranchisement of voters in the federal electoral process remains a chilling threat to the integrity of our democratic system in America.

Mr. Speaker, The right to vote, and to fully exercise that vote, is a vital component of our collective preservation. On November 7th, 2000, only a fraction of Americans were able to exercise their right to vote and have those votes counted, while thousands, and perhaps even millions of voters were denied this constitutional right as guaranteed by the Fifteenth Amendment.

It is horrifying to me that such systemic mistakes were made in this election. But beyond these mistakes, there have been serious allegations of violations of the Sections 2 and 5 of the Voter Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. sec. 1973, which mandates the obligation and responsibility of the Congress to provide appropriate implementation of the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which states "the fundamental principle that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the States or the Federal Government on account of race or color." Yet we know today, that such violations of fundamental voting rights did occur during the November 7th elections throughout the nation. These irregularities also raise potential violations of several provisions of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. sec. 1973gg-5(a) which affirms the right of every U.S. citizen to cast a ballot and have that ballot be counted. We must address this today.

The need for election reform is the challenge of all Americans. President Bush himself recognized this urgency, telling members of Congress: "This is America. Everyone deserves the right to vote." Congress was reaffirmed of President Bush's commitment to the protection of the right to vote when the President's spokesman later assured members of Congress that the "President wants to make certain that one of the focuses of attention this year is electoral reform." A letter recently sent to President Bush by virtually every House Democrat, called on the administration fulfill this promise by providing "essential guidance and leadership on a national problem", yet today, half a year after the election, we are still without such leadership. So I call on the Attorney General of the United States to begin a full investigation of all alleged voting improprieties. We must clear the air.

So what can be done to remedy these problems for the future? According to a recent Washington Post article by David Broder, since the 2000 presidential election more than 1,500 election reform bills have been introduced in state legislatures around this nation. The American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations have been filing suits in California and in other states demanding that uniform methods of casting and counting ballots be put in place. I applaud these efforts and I believe that outdated technology is a large part of the problem.

We also need a greater awareness of how our voting system works. We need better and

more uniform standards, better enforcement, better education, greater and more convenient access to voting places, and a generally easier and more user-friendly electoral process.

To begin to address these problems, I have introduced several important pieces of legislation. I've recently introduced H.R. 934, a bill that would establish National Election Day on the 2nd Tuesday of November, in presidential election years, as a legal public holiday in order to substantially resolve the serious problem of the lack of time for people to vote or participate in the federal election process, due to employment commitments.

This bill would merely federalize what some states have done with great success so that employees in the private sector will be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote or take part in the electoral process as election volunteers with no restraints.

I've also introduced H.R. 60, the Secure Democracy for All Americans Act, which would establish a five member commission and provide funding necessary to perform a study into federal, state, and local voting procedures in order to produce a report and make recommendations for appropriate legislation and administrative actions. This legislation is greatly needed.

In addition, I've recently founded the bipartisan Congressional Election Reform Caucus, which was established to enable all members of Congress to engage in a serious review and dialogue of the election process in this nation as a recognition of the disenfranchisement of voters because of voter confusion, poor voter machinery and work commitments.

I have also drafted legislation that provides for much needed "provisional ballots" so that people erroneously "purged" or dropped from the voting rolls can register at the polls, vote, and have that vote counted. I am also introducing legislation that would create a uniform voter "purging" requirement, because too many states and localities have confusing and conflicting standards of how long you may remain inactive as a voter before your name is purged from the voting rolls. With my legislation, you would have a single uniform 10 years from the time you last voted until you are purged from the rolls. This makes good sense.

I would also like to commend Congressman CUMMINGS for today introducing electoral reform legislation, and for the commitment to this issue by the Congressional Black Caucus and by the many other members of this Congress who believe in this legislation.

These bills affirm our constitutional right, as citizens of this democracy, to vote and have that vote counted, because if our votes are not counted, our voices are not heard. I hope that in the months to come, our voices will come together in support of common-sense solutions and reform, and bring us closer towards our goal of equal access and equal justice under the law.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

A NEW ERA OF DEFENSE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA IS ON THE HORIZON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a new era of a defense partnership between the United States and India is on the horizon. I come to the House floor this evening to discuss the potential for stronger defense ties between these two nations.

This relationship between the United States and India makes sense, and it is time that the world's two greatest democracies come together as natural allies. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see India and the U.S. form a stable defense alliance. Such an alliance would help secure our national security and those of our allies while isolating nations such as China, which pose a threat to India and other Asian democracies.

Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage, who called on New Delhi in a visit last weekend, said that he was very pleased with the warm support and cooperation extended by the Indian government on various matters, including defense and military cooperation. Bridging a new defense relationship with India would be remarkable, given the history of this nation's ties with the United States in the past.

During the Cold War, India unofficially joined hands with Russia in the non-alignment movement. This created tense relations between the United States and India, and ultimately the U.S. viewed India negatively. However, the Cold War is over. We have no reason to view India as a threat.

In fact, India and the United States have many similar democratic interests, and as a result, both countries could work together and work together well against the threat from a military buildup in China or from rogue nations in Asia that threaten American interests.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are still reeling from the incident last month when Chinese authorities detained a U.S. plane and military personnel. This incident and others exacerbate the difference between our democratic system and China's Communist regime. It highlights the need to have India, a stable democracy for over 50 years, as an ally in the region.

It was well documented that the Chinese have transferred missile technologies to rogue nations. The Chinese premier has reaffirmed this during a recent visit to Pakistan, during which he disclosed his commitment to helping Pakistan develop its military.

Threats to U.S. security loom large in Asia. Pakistan is politically unstable, is full of terrorism, as is documented in the U.S. annual terrorism

report, and is moving further away from a return to civilian government.

The central Asia region is brewing with the extensive Osama bin Laden networks, which hold another comprehensive threat to U.S. security and regional interests. We do not need to look back too far, just to last year, to remember the tragic incident of the USS Cole.

U.S.-India defense relationships have increased under the Bush administration. This was clearly evidenced in external affairs minister Jaswant Singh's visit to Washington last month when President Bush, Secretary Powell, Secretary Rumsfeld, and national security adviser Condoleezza Rice made commitments to build on our relationship and to increase cooperation on defense and military matters bilaterally.

This is evidenced in the prompt scheduling of the U.S. Joint Chiefs chairman General Henry H. Sheldons visit to India later this month to discuss high-level military issues between the two nations.

If a U.S.-India defense relationship can be nurtured, I believe it will improve bilateral, commercial, and trade ties and expand our existing investment commitments.

In order for us to do this in a substantial way, we must first remove all remaining sanctions on India. Many American and Indian scholars, as well as officials from the Department of State, have now acknowledged that the sanctions have done more harm to American companies doing business in India than to India itself, and removal of the sanctions will allow us to engage in a more comprehensive relationship with India.

Mr. Speaker, collaboration between the United States and India is moving both countries in a positive direction. As two great democracies, the United States and India are natural allies, and a strong defense relationship is the next logical step in our foreign policy.

1600

BUSH ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), Chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) for yielding to me.

Folks in America, of course, Mr. Speaker, realize that today the Vice President of the United States was able to come up with an energy policy that makes an awful lot of sense, and tonight myself and some of my colleagues from the Committee on Resources would like the opportunity to discuss that issue.

It never ceases to amaze me when some of my colleagues or environmentalists lash out at big oil as if it were some diabolical archenemy lurking in the shadows ready to pounce.

It is amusing to watch them stage press conferences to make big oil some sort of bogeyman for environmental problems and for our current energy crisis, and afterwards step into their energy-consuming SUVs or gasoline-powered cars and drive over asphalt-paved roads in their nicely lit, air-conditioned homes which were built and furnished with hundreds of products derived from chemicals, plastics, and other materials because of petroleum.

It reminds me of the story of school children raised in the city, being asked where milk comes from, and having them respond and say well, it comes from the store.

Somehow, I think we are all missing an important step: the production phase. The oil has to come from somewhere. The energy we all consume, the lights in this building to keep the cameras functioning, has to come from somewhere.

As our economy grows, we have children and grandchildren and they grow up, receive educations, get married, get jobs, raise families. Where are they going to get the energy that sustains life, warms their homes, and transports their children to school? Where are we going to get our energy and what are we going to do about the current building energy crisis?

Many of my environmental friends say that we really do not need to focus on production of more oil or energy sources because of various environmental concerns. Usually urban dwellers, these individuals assert that conservation is the answer.

Harkening back to the days of Jimmy Carter, when we were told just to turn our thermostats down and put on a sweater, I do not believe that we can conserve our way out of this situation. It did not work in Jimmy Carter's day, and with even more demands today it certainly will not be the only answer.

Yes, we can and should do all we can to not be wasteful in our homes and at work. We should all turn off lights that we are not using, install more fuel-efficient heating and cooling systems, and encourage the development of alternative fuels and more fuel-efficient vehicles.

But is the answer to our current crisis for all to rush out and purchase hybrid gas-electric vehicles that are small, underpowered, and fail to meet even the most basic transportation hauling requirements of the typical American family, let alone thinking about buying one of these vehicles to pull our boat down to our favorite lake, camping trailer to our favorite campground?

It would probably pull the bumper right off the car while sitting in the driveway. We are not there yet, and we have a long ways to go.

Those of us from the West know all too well the hurt that the lack of energy and increase in oil and gas prices is causing our economies. We in the West often have to travel dozens of miles and hours at a time just to commute across long distances between our communities.

In the First District of Utah that I represent, it would take nearly 7 hours, traveling at the legal speed limit from between 65 to 75 miles per hour, to travel from the northern border of Utah to the southern border, a distance of over 400 miles.

Often, our communities are spread across vast distances, and the only viable option for transportation has to be using motor vehicles. The skyrocketing price of fuel has hit them especially hard. They do not have the option, as urban dwellers in the East may have, to take mass transit or ride a bicycle to work.

For the sake of our quality of our life, our jobs, our economy, we have to begin to really address the energy problem that we are facing in this country.

Much of what we are facing in this country, I believe, could have been prevented or mitigated significantly if the previous administration had not been, to use the words of former Secretary Bill Richardson, asleep at the wheel on energy policy.

Over the last 8 years, I watched as the previous administration basically took their marching orders from the extreme environmentalist lobby, and whether it was through executive order or by promulgating new regulations, locked up millions of acres of public lands to any reasonable energy development.

Mr. Speaker, I watched with concern as the Clinton administration let our Nation drift from less than 33 percent dependence on foreign oil when he took office to more than 50 percent today. I believe the figure is 57 percent.

President Bush has taken over the reins of government and has been left one messy problem to clean up regarding energy.

For 8 years, all we got was poll-driven photo-ops, like the infamous release of millions of gallons of water to float a kayak down the Connecticut River in order to provide a nice picture of Vice President Gore in his election efforts. All we got was President Clinton dispatching then-Secretary Richardson to the OPEC masters to literally get on his knees and beg and beg them not to raise oil prices.

America deserves better, and I am glad that President George Bush has made development and implementation of a coherent and comprehensive long-term strategy on energy as one of his very top priorities.

I just met with President Bush this week, and I know that President Bush and Vice President CHENEY understand the complexities of this issue. They are committed to working with Congress to come up with the tools that are

needed to fix the problem. But there is no easy fix.

We must all recognize that natural resources are to be actively managed and wisely employed to advance the human condition.

We must have a policy that balances competing goods of environmental preservation or restoration, while ensuring public access and outdoor recreation to our public lands.

America needs balanced conservatism that recognizes man's role as God's steward, not the extreme environmentalist view that it too often views as the problem.

Just like the urban school child who may think that milk comes from a carton and not a cow, we as Americans need to look beyond the overinflated rhetoric of extreme environmentalist alarms that the Earth is in the balance, and educate ourselves on where our energy comes from and what the options are for our future.

We need to separate facts from assertion and science from political dogma. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with this administration as chairman of the Committee on Resources to do our part.

We all have been affected by rising energy prices, not just California. Wyoming Governor Jim Geringer recently recounted to the House Committee on Resources the story of a distraught elderly woman who called a Wyoming county commissioner in tears because her natural gas bill to heat her modest home was \$500 a month and her Social Security check, which she relied on to provide medicine and food, was only \$600.

The crisis is hurting the elderly, the poor, farmers, and small business owners. Small family farmers, who are our Nation's real endangered species, are feeling the crunch of huge increases in diesel fuel to power their tractors. The fertilizer they use, which is a petroleum-derived product, has skyrocketed even as commodity prices have remained low or fallen.

It will be a miracle if many more of them hang on and survive in the next few months.

What about the trucking industry? We all benefit from a strong and robust trucking industry. The fresh food and produce we buy at our local supermarkets is made possible only because of truckers. If they were to shut down for even 1 week, our Nation would be in a lot of distress. Their costs for fuel have skyrocketed, along with everyone else.

What is the effect? Who pays for all of these increased costs? In the short term, the truckers and farmers must pay these large costs, and it is hurting them big time. In the long run, we all pay for these increased costs.

Petroleum products make up such a large percentage of everyday life, so many things we totally take for granted, so that it will not take long until we see these negative effects.

We must take action. We must do it today, Mr. Speaker. Vice President

CHENEY's energy task force report points the way to a long-term solution to our energy crisis that includes conservation but goes further to include more research into clean, renewable energy sources and increased production of hydropower, nuclear energy, gas, oil and coal.

I am sure Congress will follow this plan closely this summer in preparing a package that provides reliable, affordable, and environmentally-clean energy for decades to come, while maintaining consumer choices in our standard of living.

Right now our Nation's energy problems have taken on an urgency we have not seen for almost 30 years. For the first time in memory, demand for electricity in the West this summer is expected to exceed maximum output. Demand could exceed supply by as much as 7,000 megawatts during parts of June, July, and August.

The production strain on the power grid will be so great that several hot days or a power plant failure could trigger outages that would cascade like dominoes through the West.

Shortages are coupled with soaring prices. Gasoline is already over \$2.70 a gallon in some parts of California. We have all heard predictions of \$3 a gallon in California and the Midwest before the summer is out.

Al Gore's book, *Earth in the Balance*, called for those higher gas prices, which may explain one reason why the previous administration did nothing to forestall this crisis.

Natural gas prices jumped sharply this winter and will jump again this summer when natural gas is used at its annual peak. These prices have already driven up the costs of goods, services, and housing across the country.

Skyrocketing prices threaten small business. They threaten the health of the ill and the elderly who must choose between livable temperatures or buying food. Low-income families, anxious to keep infants and small children comfortable, have already tapped out most State and local emergency assistance programs.

The crisis did not happen overnight. It took us a lot of years to get there. It has been 20 years since a large refinery was built in the U.S. and more than 10 years since a power plant was built in California, even as the population there continued to increase dramatically.

We have neglected energy production and infrastructure. We are producing 30 percent less oil now than 30 years ago. Natural gas development on public lands is down by 14 percent, and we need at least 38,000 miles of pipeline to deliver the natural gas we need.

Our new economy runs almost entirely on electricity. Yet, according to the Edison Electric Institute, investment in our transmission system has declined by 15 percent a year since 1990, while use has jumped 400 percent in the last 4 years alone.

Our transmission grids across the country need repair, updating, and ex-

pansion. The Bonneville Power Administration provides affordable power to hundreds of towns and western cities. But Bonneville Power has not added new transmission lines in the system in 14 years, and much of its grid is 30 years old.

Bringing the system up to an adequate capacity will cost an estimated \$775 million. The strategy in the Bush energy plan is both comprehensive and long term.

The Bush administration recognizes that hasty, short-term fixes threaten both our economy and environment. Decisions made in a crisis prompt us to waive environmental regulations.

In the late 1970s and 1980s, after a profound energy price shock, the Federal Government established the Energy Mobilization Board to override Federal, State, and local environmental laws that got in the way of energy production. Right now, Clean Air Act limits are being waived in California in a rush to avert a large disaster. By focusing on diverse long-term solutions, the Bush energy plan avoids these kinds of choices in the future.

Short-term fixes also threaten our economy. Upgrading and expanding our infrastructure requires investment money. Yet utility companies are reporting that Wall Street is alarmed by talk of price caps in California.

They are understandably hesitant to invest in companies that could be impacted by these price caps. We desperately need to invest in our Nation's energy infrastructure, fully and with confidence. We must avoid short-term fixes that pose long-term threats to our economy and environment.

The Bush energy plan calls for prudent streamlining of the process for licensing new nuclear plants and the recycling of hydropower plants.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big fan of nuclear power. Regardless of what the American public has been led to believe by the likes of the Hollywood bunch or antinuclear activists, new technologies and nuclear power have made it the most safe, affordable, and environmentally friendly form of energy.

New technology for reprocessing spent fuel rods exists and is improving. Nuclear power accounts for only 20 percent of the U.S. power supply. Yet in Europe, it is 35 percent. In France alone, it is 70 percent. This energy is clean, economical, and safe.

We have not had a new nuclear reactor built in this country in more than 20 years. It is time we stop letting inflammatory rhetoric and fear tactics of uninformed special interest groups stand between us and one of the best energy sources we have.

We must reduce the time and costs of relicensing hydroelectric plants. The previous administration created a battery of new Federal dam regulations aimed at wiping out hydropower.

Recent events have proven the previous administration to be foolish in this regard, but those regulations still stand today, and we have to do something about them. Because of them,

towns and cities that own dams must spend years and millions of dollars to relicense their dams and meet several dozen new, stringent environmental requirements. One of those dams is the Cushman Dam owned by the city of Takoma, Washington.

This dam generates enough power to light 25,000 homes for a year. The previous administration would not let the city relicense its dam unless it met several dozen new environmental requirements that will cost tens of millions of dollars. That city is now fighting in court for the very survival of the primary power source.

□ 1615

In Utah and Arizona, Lake Powell produces tremendous amounts of clean hydropower. Yet, extreme environmental groups like the Sierra Club are advocating working toward decommissioning the dam and draining the lake, all to let a river run through it. Yet, to make up for the lost electricity, it would take at least five coal-fired generating plants.

Sometimes we are not too smart on how we approach complex problems. Hydropower is clean and renewable, and we must do more, not less, in that area. We need to maximize power generation of Federal Bureau of Reclamation dams, even as the previous administration put regulations in place that placed power generation at the very bottom of a long list of other priorities.

The Bush energy plan calls for opening a small percentage of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil exploration and development. I totally support it.

Despite the doomsday slick commercials one sees on TV by some groups, I know it can be done in an environmentally sensitive manner. The vast majority of the refuge would remain off limits to oil production.

Current estimates suggest the oil we can gently distract from ANWR would replace Iraqi oil imports for the next 58 years. That is not just a 6 months of oil, as some special interest groups would have us believe. We are talking about replacing the oil we receive from one of the most hostile foreign governments.

Oil development on the coastal plain of ANWR will only impact 2,000 acres of 19.6 million acres. It would provide an estimated 735,000 well-paying jobs.

We have new technology to tap oil and gas in a way that protects the Arctic tundra and nearby wildlife.

ANWR is not only rich in oil but is rich in natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, in October of 1996, then-President Clinton announced that he had created the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, and with one fell swoop of his mighty pen, and without so much as a scintilla of input from any elected official from the State of Utah, locked up a million acres of public lands from future coal or energy development.

That is my home. I know a lot about southern Utah. I have lived there all of my life. I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, we locked up a trillion tons of low-sulfur coal that could be used and done in an environmentally sound way.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton had made the statement when he announced it, he said "We can't have mines everywhere." No. Mr. Clinton is right. We cannot have mines just anywhere, just where it is there. Just like Willy Sutton was quoted as saying, when asked why he robbed so many banks, he said "because that's where the money is". The reason we have mines in places is because that is where the ore is.

By locking up the Grand Staircase, our Nation has lost a mammoth reserve of high-Btu, low-sulphur coal that could power hundreds of cities in this country for centuries to come. The impact on the surface of the site would be almost negligible.

In conclusion, let me just say the future is bright. I know Americans know how to handle a problem when they see it coming, but they want somebody who will give them some direction. American people are bright, and they are patriotic.

As President Bush and Vice President CHENEY said, we have got a plan for you; we can make it work. I think the American people will realize we all have to sacrifice a little bit; but in the long run, we will be better off. It is the people who never have a plan, who are asleep at the switch, who are the ones, who have given us trouble at this time.

Now is the time for America to say here is a good plan, let us get behind it, and let us follow it.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, in my opinion, the biggest problem we have got out there is not so much the immediate energy crisis that we now face, it is the fact of our dependency upon foreign countries for our energy needs.

Right now, today, as we speak, 60 percent of our energy requirements come from foreign countries. We cannot afford for the future of this country, for future generations, for planning the future progress of this country to continue to increase our dependency or, in fact, to continue to have our dependency at a 60 percent rate. It puts this country in high danger of energy espionage or energy blackmail.

We cannot continue that path of going down that direction because the direction or the result of where that leads us is not good for future generations.

There are two separate ways, two methods to address our dependency on foreign oil. One of those methods, of course, as we have heard from the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the previous speaker, is more exploration. We have got to find more of our own energy resources.

But the second one, and this was highlighted today and it has been high-

lighted again and again and again, is conservation. Conservation is something that everybody in America can practice this minute, this hour.

Those of us on this floor, those of us across this country, as we hear these comments, we can begin to conserve energy. We can begin to become less dependent on foreign oil by exercising a little individual responsibility ourselves.

I will give my colleagues an example. Right now our latest census, I think, showed our population at about 282 million people. Can one imagine how much energy we would save if 282 million people that were using lights turned off the light as they left the room. Think of the instant savings in electricity.

If we had 282 million people who combined trips to the grocery store every week, every Sunday, if these 282 million people took a look and said, all right, we ought to have our groceries. Here is what we need this week. Let us go to the grocery store once instead of three times, or let us go twice instead of three times.

Now, obviously we do not have a clear factor of 282 million people because we have young people and there are people that do not drive, et cetera. But my colleagues understand the point.

Imagine how much water we could save, how much energy on water heaters we could save if, instead of running the garbage disposal with hot water, we ran our garbage disposal with cold water, if these millions and millions of people ran that garbage disposal for 20 seconds, which really in most cases is adequate to dispose of the garbage that one has, instead of continuing to allow the water and the electricity generating, running the garbage disposal to run for 60 seconds or 70 seconds.

We can conserve as the citizens of this country. We can contribute to help alleviate this problem. I have got a couple of examples. Now I am not going to go through all of these because I have several of my colleagues that I think have very important points to offer. But there are some key conservation areas that I am asking those of you who are hearing me, who are listening to go ahead and deploy yourself this evening in your own home. Set an example in your own home.

The best thing you can do when you go home this evening, most of us use ceiling fans for cooling in the summer. In the summer, make sure your fans are running in a clockwise direction. Clockwise. Because that is what pulls the cool air off the floor.

So when you go home this evening, look at your ceiling fan. Most ceiling fans will run both directions. I would guess that many of you today, when you go home, will find out that your fan is actually going counter-clockwise. If you move it, simply one flick of the switch to clockwise, you have done something today to help conserve energy in this country.

Many of you own automobiles. I would bet most of you who own an automobile have not read your owner's manual; or maybe when you purchased the car, in my particular case, several years ago, you read the owner's manual then, but you have not looked at it since.

Take a look at your local newspaper. Your local quick lube. They say change your oil every 3,000 miles. Do you know what the experts say, that major automobile company that designed your automobile, that were in charge of the manufacture of your automobile? More likely than not, you are not required to change your oil every 3,000 miles. In fact, if you look at your owner's manual tonight on your way home from work, I will bet you it says in your owner's manual change the oil every 5,000 miles or every 6,000 miles.

Do you know that, if we could get people to change their oil when the owner's manual tells them to change their oil instead of changing their oil when the marketing enterprises out there, the quick lubes tell you to change your oil, we could save a minimum, a minimum in this country of 11 million barrels of oil a day. We could start today.

There are a number of different things. Do you know how much energy we could save if people simply closed the refrigerator after they walked away from it, if people shut off the air conditioner when they were not going to be home?

A lot of us want to help get this country out of this problem. A lot of us in our hearts, we do not have it in our hearts to waste energy. We have it in our heart to be good citizens, and good citizens help conserve energy.

Let me just summarize it like this. I have had a number of constituents who have said to me, gosh, it is going to take a while for us to get electrical generation in place ready to go. It is going to take a while for us to find additional energy resources so that we can lessen our dependency on foreign oil. What can we do in the meantime?

Again, let me repeat to all of my colleagues, as we leave these Chambers, we can help immediately by turning out lights, by not changing that oil every 3,000 miles, by making sure that the direction of the ceiling fan is going as it should go.

I myself this morning, as I walked into my office, it is routine for me when I get to my office to turn on all the lights in my office. But for the first 2 hours I am in my own office in the morning, I sit at one location in my office; and I read newspapers. I only need one light. I do not need six lights. This morning in my office, I only had one light on, not six lights. The rest of my colleagues can do that as well.

So my contribution to these comments this afternoon is let us all contribute today to conservation. That is exactly what the Republican plan calls for. That is exactly what our President and our Vice President have said.

Again, we need two elements to lessen our dependency on foreign oil. We need to look for other energy resources. There is no question about it. We need to do it in an environmentally clean and safe manner. But we also need to conserve. If we combine those two elements, this country will, I think in a modest period of time, fairly quickly move out of this energy crisis, and we will be secure with energy for the future generations. That is what is critical.

ENERGY SHORTAGE MAY BE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM FACED IN YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 31 minutes, the remainder of the leadership hour.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem facing this country, an energy shortage, may be the most serious problem we have faced in years. The California brownouts are only a symptom of a huge energy shortage that is prevalent in this country.

Ten dollar oil and a dollar per gallon gas lulled this country into a comfort zone that all is well with energy availability.

The Clinton-Gore administration, unfortunately, had no energy policy. The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation, and conservation is appropriate, and renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet, they supported new difficult regulations that made it almost impossible to realize this hydro, the most prevalent of renewables.

The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet their regulations and policies did not support the relicensing of hydro, the most prevalent renewable source. They certainly did not propose the renewal or to make it easy to renew the operating license of existing safe nuclear plants. In fact, in reality, the Clinton-Gore administration started phasing out fossil fuel production before there was a replacement available.

So today we have a shortage of almost all kinds of energy. When one looks at how we make electricity today, 52 percent of our electricity comes from coal; 20 percent comes from nuclear, but most of those plants need to be relicensed and many felt it would be unable to relicense them in the last administration; 7 percent comes from hydro, and many feel it is going to be very difficult under the last administration's rules and regulations to relicense hydro, the most available renewable energy we have and the cleanest. Natural gas currently powers 16 percent of electric generation; oil, 3 percent; other renewables, 2 percent.

Now, we need to continue on the other renewables. We need to continue

with solar and wind and geothermal. But if we double it, it will only produce 4 percent of our electricity. If we triple it, it will only produce 6 percent of our electricity.

□ 1630

In the next 20 years America's demand for oil will increase by 33 percent according to the Energy Information Institute. We are increasingly dependent, as we have already heard, on foreign governments for our oil. Back in 1973, when we were in crisis, we imported just 36 percent of our oil from overseas. Today we are somewhere between 58 and 60 percent. The number of U.S. refineries has been cut in half since 1980. A few have expanded, but no new ones have been built.

Then we come to natural gas. Consumer prices for natural gas have spiked this year. Home heating costs have doubled. I know industries who use a lot of gas who had their rates double, triple, and quadruple. America's demand for natural gas is expected to rise even more dramatically than oil. According to the Department of Energy, by the year 2020 we will consume 62 percent more natural gas than we do today.

In fact, one of my fears, one of my personal fears that I have been observing for the last couple of years is the amount of gas we have allocated to generation, because it is the quickest to build and it is the cleanest fuel we can burn to make electricity. The amount we have allocated to generation is greater than the amount that is being predicted to come into the system.

What happens when we use more than we have? The prices are going to escalate. It is the one fuel that worries me because it is what most American seniors use to heat their homes. It is what most American businesses have as the fuel that runs their business. Our hospitals and our schools and our universities, most of them use natural gas. If natural gas prices spike excessively again this year, we will have a huge heavy load placed on business, we will harm the economy, and we will force seniors to not be able to live in their homes.

Right now an estimated 40 percent of potential gas supplies in the United States are on Federal lands that are either closed to exploration or limited by severe restrictions. When we look at the map, the whole California coastline is closed, the whole eastern coastline of this country is closed, all of the area around Florida is closed; and yet other countries drill all around their shorelines and use natural gas as their heat. I guess Norway is one of the best at it.

Even if we find supplies of gas, moving it to market will require an additional 38,000 miles of pipeline and 255,000 miles of transmission line at huge costs.

Electricity, hydroelectric power generation, as I said earlier, is expected to fall sharply because of relicensing.

Coal has historically been America's one source for affordable electricity. It currently powers half of America's electricity generators. Our Nation has enough coal to keep those plants running for 250 years. In fact, we have 40 percent of the world's coal, and we have 2 percent of the world's oil. It seems to me that coal should not be in a phase-out mode, as it has been with the past administration. We must use clean coal technologies to ensure this country's future for energy in the future.

Coal generators have already been required to make broad reductions in emissions. The Bush administration supports these efforts and will back it up with greater incentives for investments in clean coal technology. President Bush made the right decision not to impose new Federal mandates on the emissions of carbon dioxide. That is the same gas we breathe out when we breathe. There are those who have criticized him for that. If he had allowed those regulations to come into place, coal use in this country would have come to a screeching stop because there is no replacement for it.

If America is to continue to have reliable electricity over the next 20 years, coal must play a continued role. If coal does not play a major role, from my point of view, this country will have very high energy prices and this country will face an economic recession. Nuclear power and hydroelectric face uncertain futures due to past policies. Hopefully, they will not under this new administration.

I am encouraged by the recommendation of the energy plan to increase our domestic energy supply by utilizing our public lands in a reasonable manner. Our Nation's public lands could and should play a role in sustainable energy policy. Thanks to so many new incredible developments in energy research, exploration and technology over the last 20 years, we can confidently explore for oil and gas and coal on our public lands in an environmentally-sound manner without leaving anything other than a small footprint.

The Federal Government owns one-third of this country; yet there are those who are opposed to use of public lands for energy production. One-third of America is owned by the Federal Government, and when we add State and local governments, somewhere between 45 and 50 percent of this country is owned by government. If all that land is going to be locked up to resource use, this country does not have an economic future.

Yes, ANWR is one of the areas where there is lots of discussion. The Energy Department says the coastal plain of ANWR is the largest unexplored potentially productive onshore basin for oil and gas in the United States. ANWR could contain enough oil to offset all Iraq imports for the next 46 years. Oil production in Alaska's Arctic occurs under the world's best environmental

standards. Many of the countries we rely on for oil have little or no environmental regulations.

Oil development is strongly supported by the Eskimo people who actually live on the north slope of Alaska and by 75 percent of all Alaskans. Exploration would be done using 21st century technology, supercomputers, ice roads that melt in the spring, and directional drilling. Only 3 square miles of the coastal plain of the 30,600 square miles of ANWR would be affected. Only 3 square miles. That would leave 30,597 square miles untouched.

I certainly think for the future of this country, having a strong energy source, and none of these are a silver bullet, none of these solve the problem; but we need them all. It is the equivalent of building an airport one-fifth the size of Dulles in the State of South Carolina. The caribou herd in and near the Prudhoe Bay oil field is five times larger than when development began. All other wildlife species are healthy, no endangered species. Contrary to the myth the environmental extremists created, there is no north slope oil being exported. None has been since May 2000. When it was exported, no more than 5 percent was sold abroad. This is less than exported by the West Coast of the United States.

We barely think about the plight of the American farmer, but agriculture is paying huge costs because of energy. The cost of fertilizer has risen. In fact, some fertilizer plants have actually gone out of business. Some fertilizer plants sold their gas this year because they could make more money in selling the gas than producing the fertilizer.

We have not built a refinery in this country since 1976. In fact, 36 U.S. refineries have closed since 1992. We have not built a nuclear reactor in 20 years. California has not built a power plant of any sort in 10 years. According to Edison Electric Institute, our investment in our electricity infrastructure has dropped 15 percent since 1990; yet use of that system has jumped 400 percent in just the last 4 years. Most of the new plants built in this country are being fueled by natural gas, but we need to have the natural gas to run them.

The future of America depends on an energy policy. I have strong faith in the Bush administration and their proposal to take us where we need to be. There should be debate. Conservation should lead the road. We all need to get into the conservation business. We must use our energy wisely, but we must have a strong source of energy so that we have choices and people have options.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 21 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I am obviously from California, and I would like to talk about some of the problems that we have in California. They are obviously well publicized. Some of the things people talk about are true, and certainly some things are not true.

First, I would like to congratulate my home State of California. No State uses less electricity per capita than the people in the State of California. I think many people may find that as a surprise, but that is the truth. No State uses less electricity per capita than the State of California.

No State uses more renewable energy than any State other than California. California has been a leader on wind. Right in my own county, Riverside County, in the Banning Pass, if any of my colleagues have been to Palm Springs, they can drive down the I-10 freeway and see row upon row upon row of wind machines that supply needed peaking electricity to Southern California.

No State uses more solar power than the State of California. We have really invested a significant amount of money in California into solar research and the utilization of solar power.

No State uses more geothermal than the State of California. Really, the geothermal industry started in Imperial County, California. If my colleagues go down into Imperial County near the Salton Sea in the beautiful State of California, they can see these huge geothermal plants that were developed to produce electricity.

All of that in California. People in California doing the best they can to conserve electricity, to use renewable energy in California. But today we know that that is still not enough.

Now, there have been reports that California has not built a power plant in 10 years. That is not true. I do not want to correct some of my friends, but we have built power plants in California in the last 10 years. Not large power plants. Certainly there have been power plants built outside of California that import power into California.

I congratulate Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power, who gets a significant amount of their electricity, the City of Los Angeles, a significant amount of their electricity from the State of Utah using coal, the clean coal that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) talked about. And I congratulate Mayor Riordan who now is in negotiation with the people in Utah to develop additional plants, one plant that was discussed as large as 3,500 megawatts in the State of Utah, to transmit power into Los Angeles for future demand. That is necessary along with plants being built in California.

Certainly natural gas has been talked about. It is the preferred fuel source in California. But we have a problem in California, in not being able to get enough gas into the State of California because of all of these gas turbine plants that are being built. There have

been a lot built of late and a lot more coming online. And we are happy to have them, but we do not have enough natural gas distribution coming into the State of California, which is adding to the increased price of natural gas within our State. So we have an infrastructure problem, not just with gas pipelines coming into California, but with the infrastructure around refineries. Refineries have been talked about. We have far less refining capability in California than we used to have.

California is well known because we have a lot of people, 35 million people. We certainly have a significant number of them living in the L.A. Basin and we have air quality issues. We have done a great job of cleaning up the air in Los Angeles. Doing that we have come up with our own fuel standards in California. We have lower sulfur than any other State in the Union, 15 parts per million or less in gasoline. California was the first State to do that. The U.S. EPA has now required the rest of the States to meet that standard, but California did it first.

Now, one of the unintended consequences of that is many of the refineries did not have enough capital so they went out of business rather than spending the money to upgrade that refinery to meet the new environmental standard. That was an unintended consequence. We do not have enough refineries, so even if we have additional oil, or the price of oil goes down, we cannot get enough petroleum products through a limited number of refineries. So we need to get incentives to build additional refineries to build the clean type of gasoline we need in California and throughout the country.

By the way, one of the problems my people in California, the people that drive every day have in California, is we have a stranded market in essence on gasoline because we have a different kind of gas standard than any other State in the Union. So we cannot import gasoline from anywhere. We have to produce all the gasoline that we make in our State for our drivers.

With respect to the Speaker, I will not get into the issue of oxidates today, but nevertheless to say that we in California will always produce clean gasoline; but we want to make sure we produce it economically and at the best cost available to the people of the State of California.

We do have a crisis in California. We have a crisis throughout this country on energy, and I am so pleased that we now have a President who will address it and a Vice President who took upon himself the time, and certainly in this last 100 days there have been a lot of pressures on this new administration, to recognize this problem that has been neglected for too long.

□ 1645

Now as we proceed with a long-term solution, and we did not get here over-

night, certainly in California's case it took many years to get to the point that we are at today, but we finally will see a solution to the problem. I say to my friends and constituents, be patient. I know it is difficult. I filled up my car last week and it cost \$35. No one should tolerate blackouts and these kinds of cost increases, but we have done it to ourselves. But we can get out of it because we have a policy that in the next number of years will bring us down the road to better energy independence, both with electricity and fuel.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time for my colleagues.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 14 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the energy policy released today by the administration.

Madam Speaker, for the last several years we have had a strong economy, primarily because we have had affordable and reliable sources of energy; but now we are in an energy crisis which threatens our economic future and our national security.

The President and Vice President have come together and put together a plan, and today they released their national energy policy, which I would encourage every Member and every individual in America to get a copy of and read it through. It is a comprehensive plan. The President recognizes the problem. He is concerned about the effects that high energy prices, both in gasoline and in electricity, will have on the American people and on our economy. We have a bold, new approach to addressing the energy policy in this country.

We need reliable, affordable, and clean energy increases. We need improved infrastructure. We cannot meet tomorrow's challenges with yesterday's technologies. We need new technologies to meet the demands. Some people will say those technologies are not here yet. I will say, Madam Speaker, that Americans are second to none in their ability to solve problems when they set their minds to it. We are the most technologically advanced Nation on Earth. If we set our minds to solving a problem, we can do it.

The President's leadership comes at a very critical time, but we must act now if we are going to have a comprehensive plan to address the energy crisis which will be with us for several years if we do not act. If anyone questions whether there is a serious energy shortage in this country, let me just give a few statistics.

Over the next 20 years, U.S. oil consumption will rise by 33 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. natural gas consumption will rise by over 50 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. electricity consumption will rise by 45 percent. Since 1992, oil production is down 17 percent in this country, while consumption is up 14 percent. In 1993, we were reliant on foreign oil for 35 percent of our demands. That was during the oil crisis that we had in 1973.

We said at that time we needed to become less dependent on foreign oil because our economy was subject to the whims of those countries in OPEC. Instead of becoming less reliant on foreign oil, we are now nearly 60 percent reliant on foreign oil for our oil needs. The U.S. spends roughly \$300 million a day, or about \$100 billion a year on foreign oil.

It is obvious that the demands for energy in the future are going to increase in this country. So what have we done in the way of supply? In 1990, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 405,000 in the United States. In 1999, 10 years later, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 293,000, down 27 percent. In 1990, in the United States, U.S. oil rigs, we had 657 of them in the United States. In the year 2000, working U.S. oil rigs, 153; a 77 percent decline. Thirty-six oil refineries have closed since 1992, and we have not built a new oil refinery since 1976.

The previous administration had no, I repeat, had no long-term energy policy. It seems the energy policy of the past administration was to shut down exploration as we became more reliant on foreign oil, to shut down refineries, to shut down research on clean coal and finding new sources of coal, to shut down nuclear research. It seems that you could sum up the past administration's energy policy as the "Do not worry, be happy," energy policy.

As I said, we have in this country a supply and demand problem, and that is essentially what the energy crisis is, a supply and demand problem.

Let me summarize what President Bush's energy plan does. It is 105 specific recommendations. Forty-two of those recommendations are targeted at conservation. Much has been said by our opponents that the President does not rely heavily enough on conservation. Forty-two of the recommendations are targeted at conservation; 35 recommendations are targeted at energy supply; 25 of the recommendations are targeted at increased energy security; 12 of the recommendations can be done through executive order; 73 of the recommendations are directives to Federal agencies; 20 of the recommendations will require action by this Congress.

Briefly, let me go through the major portions of his recommendations.

First, conservation. He wants to expand government support for programs for conservation, improved energy efficiency for appliances, improved conservation efforts in Federal buildings, and support new fuel-efficient technology for vehicles, buses, transit and other transportation.

In the area of renewable and alternative energies, he wants renewed focus on renewable and alternative energy, reduced delays in geothermal leasing processes, help for communities that want to use renewable energy, so that they can do so; extend and expand wind and biomass tax credits; a new 15 percent tax credit for residential solar energy. He wants to put \$1.2 billion in ANWR proceeds to renewable research, a new tax credit for the purchase of new hybrid or fuel cell vehicles, expand research on hydrogen and fusion energy. It sounds to me like he has concentrated much of his effort on conservation and renewable and alternative energy sources.

In clean-coal technology, President Bush wants to invest \$2 billion over the next 10 years in new clean-coal technologies.

In the area of oil and natural gas, he wants to review the impediments to oil and gas leasing on Federal lands; review regulations on outer Continental Shelf energy development; consider additional leases in the national petroleum reserve in Alaska, and work with Congress to look at the possibility of leasing portions of ANWR which were set aside specifically to look for new energy sources, oil and gas, to work with Congress to look at making some leases in those areas of ANWR for oil and gas exploration.

In the area of nuclear energy, he wants to streamline the relicensing of existing nuclear power plants. There are many nuclear power plants that will be up for relicensing in the near future, which may not ask for relicensing because of the cost and time delays necessary to relicense these plants.

Madam Speaker, nuclear energy is truly one of the cleanest and environmentally friendly forms of energy that we can have. With the technologies that are being developed today at the INEEL in Idaho and in Madam Speaker's district in Chicago, they are developing technologies which are reducing the amount of waste that comes from nuclear power plants. If we continue down this road, energy in the United States will be produced, I believe, largely by environmentally friendly nuclear energy.

In the area of hydropower, the administration recognizes the clean air benefits of hydropower. It also has some problems. It dams up rivers, and that causes problems with fish, as we are seeing in the Pacific Northwest. But hydropower in the Pacific Northwest is very important. Eighty-one percent of the Nation's renewable electricity comes from hydropower. Hydropower supplies approximately 70 per-

cent of the electricity in the Pacific Northwest. The administration supports reform of the relicensing process for hydroplants.

Today in Idaho we have a series of dams in the Hell's Canyon complex which have been there for some 30 years. I can understand the length of time it would take to license a new dam. If you have a free-flowing river and you suggest putting a dam in there, you would do substantial environmental studies to see the impacts that dam would have on the environment and the species and so forth. Those dams have been there for 30 years. We are trying to get them relicensed. Idaho Power is. It has taken over 10 years to relicense those dams, and millions and millions of dollars. And the people that are going to pay those dollars are the ratepayers. We need to streamline this relicensing process not only for dams but for transmission lines, for transmission pipelines, for oil and natural gas and other things.

Some people will say that this policy concentrates too much in one area and not enough in another area. I will tell you there are no silver bullets. We cannot conserve our way out of this problem. We cannot find enough oil or natural gas to get ourselves out of this problem. Nuclear power will not do it. It takes a combination of all of the efforts that we can bring to bear on this problem.

Conservation, renewable new sources of energy, new technologies, clean coal, new exploration, and nuclear energy, those are the things that are going to be necessary if we are going to address this energy crisis in the long term. And if we do not address this energy crisis in the long term, it will be back to visit us again.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that we have a President that recognizes the importance of reliable, affordable energy and the impact that it has on our economy, and I look forward to working with him to enact this policy.

CORRECTION OF PROCEEDINGS OF MAY 16, 2001, PAGE H2247

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) reserves the right to object.

Mr. FOLEY. I do, but I would like to hear the pending request from the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the Chairman very much.

First, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), they know that I tried to get an amendment in dealing with the human rights violations of Ethiopia. All I ex-

pect to do today is to indicate that thousands of students have been detained and they have been released, but—

Mr. FOLEY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) objects.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. GANSKE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the President.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BENTSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 107th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable BILL SHUSTER, Ninth Pennsylvania.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Anibal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Richard K. Armey, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, John Elias E. Baldacci, Tammy Baldwin, Cass Ballenger, James A. Barcia, Bob Barr, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Ken Bentsen, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael Bilirakis, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Rod R. Blagojevich, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood L. Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, David E. Bonior, Mary Bono, Robert A. Borski, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Allen Boyd, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ed Bryant, Richard Burr, Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Sonny Callahan, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brad Carson, Julia Carson, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Saxby Chambliss, Donna M. Christensen, Wm. Lacy Clay, Eva M. Clayton, Bob Clement, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mac Collins, Larry Combest, Gary A. Condit, John Cooksey, Jerry F. Costello, Christopher Cox, William J. Coyne, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Philip M. Crane, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Danny K. Davis, Jim Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Susan A. Davis, Thomas M. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Jim DeMint, Peter Deutsch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Calvin M. Dooley, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, Ernie Fletcher, Mark Foley, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Vito Fossella, Barney Frank, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Martin Frost, Elton Gallegly, Greg Ganske, George W. Gekas, Richard A. Gephardt, Jim Gibbons, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Paul E. Gillmor, Benjamin A. Gilman, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Porter J. Goss, Lindsey O. Graham, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Gene Green, Mark Green, James C. Greenwood, Felix J. Grucci, Jr., Gil Gutknecht, Ralph M. Hall, Tony P. Hall, James V. Hansen, Jane Harman, Melissa A. Hart, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, J. D. Hayworth, Joel Hefley, Wally Herger, Baron P. Hill, Van Hilleary, Earl F. Hilliard, Maurice D. Hinchey, David L. Hobson, Joseph M. Hoeffel, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Stephen Horn, John N. Hostettler, Amo Houghton, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Asa Hutchinson, Henry J. Hyde, Jay

Inslee, Johnny Isakson, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, William L. Jenkins, Christopher John, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Nancy L. Johnson, Sam Johnson, Timothy W. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Sue W. Kelly, Mark R. Kennedy, Patrick J. Kennedy, Brian D. Kerns, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Gerald D. Kleczka, Joe Knollenberg, Jim Kolbe, Dennis J. Kucinich, John J. LaFalce, Ray LaHood, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Steve Largent, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, James A. Leach, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, William O. Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Ken Lucas, Bill Luther, Carolyn B. Maloney, James H. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Edward J. Markey, Frank Mascara, Jim Matheson, Robert T. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Karen McCarthy, Betty McCollum, Jim McCrery, John McHugh, Scott McInnis, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. McKeon, Cynthia A. McKinney, Michael R. McNulty, Martin T. Meehan, Carrie P. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Robert Menendez, John L. Mica, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Dan Miller, Gary G. Miller, Patsy T. Mink, John Joseph Moakley, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Constance A. Morella, John P. Murtha, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, George R. Nethercutt, Jr., Robert W. Ney, Anne M. Northup, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Jim Nussle, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Tom Osborne, Doug Ose, C.L. Otter, Major R. Owens, Michael G. Oxley, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, David D. Phelps, Charles W. Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Richard W. Pomo, Earl Pomeroy, Rob Portman, David E. Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, Jack Quinn, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall, II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Bob Riley, Lynn N. Rivers, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Tim Roemer, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Marge Roukema, Edward R. Royce, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Jim Ryun, Martin Olav Sabo, Loretta Sanchez, Bernard Sanders, Max Sandlin, Tom Sawyer, Jim Saxton, Joe Scarborough, Bob Schaffer, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Edward L. Schrock, Robert C. Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, John B. Shadegg, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Christopher Shays, Brad Sherman, Don Sherwood, John Shimkus, Ronnie Shows, Rob Simmons, Michael K. Simpson, Norman Sisisky, Joe Skeen, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar S. Smith, Nick Smith, Vic Snyder, Mark E. Souder, Floyd Spence, John N. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Charles W. Stenholm, Ted Strickland, Bob Stump, Bart Stupak, John E. Sununu, John E. Sweeney, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, Charles H. Taylor, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, William M. Thomas, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, John R. Thune, Karen L. Thurman, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Patrick J. Toomey, James A. Traficant, Jr., Jim Turner, Mark Udall, Robert A. Underwood, Fred Upton, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, David Vitter,

Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Zach Wamp, Maxine Waters, Wes Watkins, Melvin L. Watt, J.C. Watts, Jr., Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Curt Weldon, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Heather Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, Albert Russell Wynn, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1965. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of May 1, 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 107-72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1966. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Venezuela, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1967. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-7320] received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1968. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7503] received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1969. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Letter of Map Revision and Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill Requests (RIN: 3067-AD13) received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1970. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7761] received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1971. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting notification that the Administration is establishing and adjusting schedules of compensation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1972. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Runaway and Homeless Youth Program (RIN: 0970-AC04) received May 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1973. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Effective Date Modification for the Determination of Nonattainment as of November 15, 1996, and Reclassification of the St. Louis Ozone Nonattainment Area; States of Missouri and Illinois [FRL-6980-7] received May 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1974. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation

of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 121-1121; FRL-6980-8] received May 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1975. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Nitrogen Oxides Budget Trading Program [DE 054-1031a; FRL-6981-4] received May 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1976. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Determination of Attainment of the NAAQS for PM-10 in the Weirton, West Virginia Nonattainment Area [WV057-6016; FRL-6979-8] received May 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1977. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting presidential certification and a memorandum of justification to permit U.S. contributions to the International Fund for Ireland with FY 2000 and 2001 Funds; to the Committee on International Relations.

1978. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility [FAC 97-27; FAR Case 1999-607] (RIN: 9000-A169) received May 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1979. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the Performance Measurement Plan for FY 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1980. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the FY 2000 Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1981. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's report on the administration of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1373(f); to the Committee on Resources.

1982. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—North Dakota Regulatory Program [ND-040-FOR; North Dakota State Program Amendment XXIX] received May 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1983. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Final 2001 Specifications for the Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Regulatory Amendment [Docket No. 010208032-1109-02; I.D. 121200L] (RIN: 0648-AM47) received May 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1984. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; 2001 Specifications [Docket No. 010319071-1103-02; I.D. 030101H] (RIN: 0648-AN71) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1985. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that funding under title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and

Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, will exceed \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared on January 24, 2001 as a result of snow which severely impacted the State of Wisconsin on December 11-31, 2000, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1986. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney PW4000 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-09; Amendment 39-12212; AD 2001-08-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1987. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-300 Series Airplanes Equipped with Motive Flow Check Valves Having Part Number 106-0007-01 [Docket No. 2001-NM-45-AD; Amendment 39-12209; AD 2001-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1988. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-352-AD; Amendment 39-12214; AD 2001-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1989. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-40-AD; Amendment 39-12216; AD 94-14-20 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1990. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 and 720 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-42-AD; Amendment 39-12179; AD 2001-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1991. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G-1159, G-1159A, G-1159B, G-IV and G-V Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-83-AD; Amendment 39-12191; AD 2001-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1992. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-12196; AD 2001-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1993. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-274-AD; Amendment 39-12195; AD 2001-08-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1994. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-273-AD; Amendment 39-12194; AD 2001-08-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1995. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340 Series Airplanes Equipped with CFM International CFM56-5C Engines [Docket No. 2000-NM-180-AD; Amendment 39-12189; AD 2001-08-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1996. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-73-AD; Amendment 39-12180; AD 2001-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1997. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal-Aid Project Agreement [FHWA Docket No. 2000-7426] (RIN: 2125-AE77) received May 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1998. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-12206; AD 2001-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1999. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; JanAero Devices 14D11 and 23D04 Series Fuel Regulator and Shutoff Valves [Docket No. 2001-CE-02-AD; Amendment 39-12178; AD 2001-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2000. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-620, A310-203, A310-221, and A310-222 Series Airplanes [RIN: 2120-AA64] received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2001. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. Model MD-900 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-15-AD; Amendment 39-12175; AD 2001-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2002. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—U.S. Flags for Burials of Certain Members of the Selected Reserve (RIN: 2900-AK56) received May 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. KING, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN):

H.R. 1885. A bill to expand the class of beneficiaries who may apply for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by extending the deadline for classification petition and labor certification filings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for appeals by third parties in certain patent reexamination proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PLATTS, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Pay Equity Act of 2000 to permit certain annuitants of the retirement programs of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to receive the adjustments in pension benefits to which such annuitants would otherwise be entitled as a result of the conversion of members of the United States Park Police and United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to a new salary schedule under the amendments made by such Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1888. A bill to eliminate corporate welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARCIA (for himself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1889. A bill to improve the utilization of educational technologies in elementary and secondary education by creating an educational technology extension service; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for inflation adjustments to the mandatory jurisdiction thresholds of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 1891. A bill to amend section 211 of the Clean Air Act to eliminate the phase-in period for the reduction of sulfur content in diesel fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CANNON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the acceptance of an affidavit of support from an-

other eligible sponsor if the original sponsor has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that the original sponsor's classification petition should not be revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CLAYTON (for herself and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1893. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study of the relative value of General Equivalency Diplomas and a review of policies and procedures to determine how the Department of Education can better serve the Nation's educational needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CLAYTON (for herself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEACH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1894. A bill to supplement current activities in the exchange of agricultural and farming expertise by establishing a grant program to support bilateral exchange programs whereby African American and other American farmers share technical knowledge with African and Caribbean Basin farmers regarding maximization of crop yields, use of risk management tools, expansion of agricultural trade, use of new financial instruments to increase access to credit, and other ways to improve farming methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HORN, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1895. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a 2-year recovery period for depreciation of computers and peripheral equipment used in manufacturing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY of California:

H.R. 1896. A bill to provide assistance to States to expand and establish drug abuse treatment programs to enable such programs to provide services to individuals who voluntarily seek treatment for drug abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. BONO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Internal Revenue Code to help solve the worsening shortage of registered nurses in hospitals and continuing care settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to update the export licensing requirements under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. NEY):

H.R. 1899. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to munic-

ipal deposits; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 1900. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1901. A bill to modify the manner in which the wage index adjustment to payments under the Medicare Program to hospitals for inpatient hospital services is calculated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 1902. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit forced overtime hours for certain health care employees who provide care to patients; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1903. A bill to establish a demonstration grant program to assist States in providing subsidies for group health insurance premiums for low-income, Medicaid-eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 1904. A bill to establish an Office of Children's Services within the Department of Justice to coordinate and implement Government actions involving unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1905. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to assure access of Medicare beneficiaries to prescription drug coverage through the NICE drug benefit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1906. A bill to amend the Act that established the Pu'uuhonua O Honaunua National Historical Park to expand the boundaries of that park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BACA, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require States to adopt and enforce standards that prohibit the use of racial profiling in the enforcement of State

laws regulating the use of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the exemption from tax for small property and casualty insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1909. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to create a grant program to promote joint activities among Federal, State, and local public child welfare and alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1910. A bill to deny Federal public benefits to individuals who were participants in Nazi persecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 1911. A bill to establish a demonstration project to provide for Medicare reimbursement for health care services provided to certain Medicare-eligible veterans in selected facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full funding for assistance for education of all children with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 1913. A bill to require the valuation of nontribal interest ownership of subsurface rights within the boundaries of the Acoma Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1914. A bill to extend for 4 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend for six months the 4.3 cent increase in motor fuel taxes enacted in 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMP (for himself and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1916. A bill to provide for the establishment, use, and enforcement of a consistent and comprehensive system for labeling violent content in audio and visual media products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution requiring a study and report on reducing discriminatory pricing of health services for the uninsured to improve access to needed health care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SUNUNU (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. ALLEN):

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution honoring the 129 sailors and civilians lost aboard the U.S.S. Thresher on April 10, 1963, and urging the Secretary of the Army to erect a memorial to this tragedy in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OSE:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideas of National Community Residential Care Month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Res. 144. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that bonuses for managerial personnel of the United States Postal Service should not be awarded in any year in which the Postal Service anticipates that it will operate at a deficit or in which a general increase in postal rates has been requested, has gone into effect, or is likely to become effective; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. SHAW, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 31: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 94: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 144: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 157: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 168: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 192: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 214: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 239: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 296: Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 300: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 326: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 396: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 425: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 436: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 460: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 476: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 477: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 518: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 526: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. MAS-CARA.

H.R. 527: Mr. LINDER, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 572: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 598: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 606: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 610: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 638: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 677: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 687: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 690: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 716: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 718: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 746: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 781: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SKELTON and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 794: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 808: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TANNER, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 822: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 826: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 830: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 848: Mr. COYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 876: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 902: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 909: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 912: Ms. DUNN and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 914: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 917: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 921: Mr. KOLBE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 951: Mr. BAKER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 968: Mr. KING, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 975: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 990: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1011: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1012: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1013: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1020: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1041: Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1052: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1055: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1056: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1057: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1058: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1059: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1060: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1061: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1097: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1102: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1110: Mr. LARGENT and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1143: Mr. OLVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1192: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1198: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 1214: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1266: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1273: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1296: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 1304: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1305: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1329: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1344: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1354: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

- H.R. 1363: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1366: Mr. McKEON, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 1367: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 1383: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. WILSON, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1411: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1436: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KING, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1466: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1490: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1494: Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 1504: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 1506: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1507: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 1509: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1536: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1581: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MICA, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1585: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1587: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, Mr. COSTELLO, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 1594: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1596: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SHOWS, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1598: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1600: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 1601: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1605: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1613: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1620: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1621: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1626: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 1642: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1644: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1650: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1663: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1667: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1690: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1699: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1707: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1718: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 1723: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1734: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1735: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1760: Mr. FRANK and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1765: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1780: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KING, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1804: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1806: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 1831: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 1835: Ms. DUNN and Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 1842: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1878: Mr. OBEY and Ms. BALDWIN.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. MOORE and Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. PLATTS, Ms. HART, Mr. REYES, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Ms. HARMAN.
H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. BONIOR.
H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. WYNN and Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Res. 97: Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 114: Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. BUYER.
H. Res. 117: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 125: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 139: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

SPECIAL ORDERS

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

On motion of Mr. Armey, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That on legislative days of Monday and Tuesday during the first session of the 107th Congress—(1) the House shall convene 90 minutes earlier than the time otherwise established by order of the House solely for the purpose of conducting “Morning-Hour Debate” (except that on Tuesdays after May 14, 2001, the House shall convene for that purpose one hour earlier than the time otherwise established by order of the House); (2) the time for morning-hour debate shall be limited to 30 minutes allocated to each party (except that on Tuesdays after May 14, 2001, the time shall be limited to 25 minutes allocated to each party and may not continue beyond 10 minutes before the hour appointed for the resumption of the session of the House); and (3) the form of proceeding to morning-hour debate shall be as follows: (a) the prayer by the Chaplain, the approval of the Journal, and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag shall be postponed until resumption of the session of the House; (b) initial and subsequent recognitions for debate shall alternate between the parties; (c) recognition shall be conferred by the Speaker only pursuant to lists submitted by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader; (d) no Member may address the House for longer than 5 minutes (except the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, or the Minority Whip); and (e) following morning-hour debate, the Chair shall declare a recess pursuant to clause 12 of rule I until the time appointed for the resumption of the session of the House. (Agreed to Jan. 3, 2001.)

SPECIAL ORDER SPEECHES

The format for recognition for morning-hour debate and restricted special order speeches, which began on February 23, 1994, was reiterated on January 4, 1995, and was supplemented on January 3, 2001, will continue to apply in the 107th Congress as outlined below:

On Tuesdays, following legislative business, the Chair may recognize Members for special-order speeches up to midnight, and such speeches may not extend beyond midnight. On all other days of the week, the Chair may recognize Members for special-order speeches up to four hours after the conclusion of five-minute special-order speeches. Such speeches may not extend beyond the four-hour limit without the permission of the Chair, which may be granted only with advance consultation between the leaderships and notification to the House. However, at no time shall the Chair recognize for any special-order speeches beyond midnight.

The Chair will first recognize Members for five-minute special-order speeches, alternating initially and subsequently between the parties, regardless of the date the order was granted by the House. The Chair will then recognize longer special-order speeches. A Member recognized for a five-minute special-order speech may not be recognized for a longer special-order speech. The four-hour limitation will be divided between the majority and minority parties. Each party is entitled to reserve its first hour for respective leaderships or their designees. Recognition will alternate initially and subsequently between the parties each day.

The allocation of time within each party’s two-hour period (or shorter period if prorated to end by midnight) is to be determined by a list submitted to the Chair by the respective leaderships. Members may not sign up with their leadership for any special-order speeches earlier than one week prior to the special-order, and additional guidelines may be established for such sign-ups by the respective leaderships.

Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule V, the television cameras will not pan the Chamber, but a “crawl indicating morning hour or that the House has completed its legislative business and is proceeding with special-order speeches will appear on the screen. Other television camera adaptations during this period may be announced by the Chair.

The continuation of this format for recognition by the Speaker is without prejudice to the Speaker’s ultimate power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XVII should circumstances so warrant. (Agreed to Jan. 3, 2001.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Paul, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Mr. Burton of Indiana be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes on May 17, 2001. (Agreed to May 10, 2001.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Cox, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Mr. Weldon of Florida be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes on May 17, 2001. (Agreed to May 15, 2001.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Grucci, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Ms. Ros-Lehtinen be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes on May 17, 2001. (Agreed to May 16, 2001.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Grucci, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Mr. Rohrabacher be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes on May 17, 2001. (Agreed to May 16, 2001.)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2001

SEC. 1

SEC. 2

SEC. 3

SEC. 4

SEC. 5

SEC. 6

SEC. 7

SEC. 8

SEC. 9

SEC. 10

SEC. 11

SEC. 12

SEC. 13

SEC. 14

SEC. 15

SEC. 16

SEC. 17

SEC. 18

SEC. 19

SEC. 20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Union Calendar	1
House Calendar	2
Private Calendar	3
Corrections Calendar	4
Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees	5
Public Laws	6
Private Laws	7
History of Bills and Resolutions:	
House Bills	8
House Joint Resolutions	9
House Concurrent Resolutions	10
House Resolutions	11
Senate Bills	12
Senate Joint Resolutions	13
Senate Concurrent Resolutions	14
Senate Resolutions	15
Reported Bills Referred under Time Limitations	16
Bills in conference	17
Bills through conference (<i>printed the first legislative day of each week the House is in session</i>).	18
Index of Short Titles (<i>printed the first legislative day of each week the House is in session</i>).	19
Index (<i>printed the first legislative day of each week the House is in session</i>)	20

THE MORNING HOUR FOR THE CALL OF COMMITTEES

Rule XIV, clause 4:

"4. After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order and then select committees. Each committee when named may call up for consideration a bill or resolution reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar. If the Speaker does not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, the next call shall resume at the point it left off, giving preference to the last bill or resolution under consideration. A committee that has occupied the call for two days may not call up another bill or resolution until the other committees have been called in their turn."

NOTE.—Call rests with the Committee on Agriculture.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Rule XV, clause 7:

"7. (a) On Wednesday of each week, business shall not be in order before completion of the call of the committees (except as provided by clause 4 of rule XIV) unless two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present, agree to a motion that the House dispense with the call. Such a motion shall be privileged. Debate on such a motion shall be limited to five minutes in support and five minutes in opposition.

(b) A bill or resolution on either the House or the Union Calendar, except bills or resolutions that are privileged under the Rules of the House, may be called under this clause. A bill or resolution called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union without motion, subject to clause 3 of rule XVI. General debate on a measure considered under this clause shall be confined to the measure and may not exceed two hours equally divided between a proponent and an opponent.

(c) When a committee has occupied the call under this clause on one Wednesday, it shall not be in order on a succeeding Wednesday to consider unfinished business previously called up by that committee until the other committees have been called in their turn unless—

(1) the previous question has been ordered on such unfinished business; or

(2) the House adopts a motion to dispense with the call under paragraph (a).

(d) If any committee has not been called under this clause during a session of a Congress, then at the next session of that Congress the call shall resume where it left off at the end of the preceding session.

(e) This rule does not apply during the last two weeks of a session of Congress.

(f) The Speaker may not entertain a motion for a recess on a Wednesday except during the last two weeks of a session of Congress."

NOTE.—Call rests with the Committee on Agriculture.

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE DAYS

Calendar Wednesday	Wednesday of each week, except during the last 2 weeks of a session (clause 7, rule XV).
Corrections Calendar	Second and fourth Tuesdays of each month (clause 6, rule XV).
Discharge Calendar	Second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of a session (clause 2, rule XV).
District of Columbia business	Second and fourth Mondays of each month (clause 4, rule XV).
Private Calendar	First and third Tuesdays of each month (clause 5, rule XV).
Suspension of rules	Mondays and Tuesdays and during the last 6 days of a session (clause 1, rule XV).

1. UNION CALENDAR

Rule XIII, clause 1(a):

“(1) A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to which shall be referred public bills and public resolutions raising revenue, involving a tax or charge on the people, directly or indirectly making appropriations of money or property or requiring such appropriations to be made, authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring a claim to the Court of Claims.”

2001 Feb. 27	Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. (H. Doc. 107-1)	Address to the Joint Session of Congress.	No. 3
H.R. 90 Mar. 12	Mr. Tauzin (Energy and Commerce). Rept. 107-13	To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes.	8
H.R. 1209 Apr. 20	Mr. Sensenbrenner (Judiciary). Rept. 107-45	To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed, and for other purposes.	28
H.R. 863 Apr. 20	Mr. Sensenbrenner (Judiciary). Rept. 107-46	To provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders.	29
H.R. 622 May 15	Mr. Thomas (Ways and Means). Rept. 107-64	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes.	35
H.R. 1 May 14 Part I May 15 Judiciary discharged	Mr. Boehner (Education and the Workforce). Rept. 107-63	To close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.	38

2001			No.

2. HOUSE CALENDAR

Rule XIII, clause 1(a):
“(2) A House Calendar, to which shall be referred all public bills and public resolutions not requiring referral to the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.”

2001 H. Con. Res. 73 Apr. 4	Mr. Hyde (International Relations). Rept. 107–40	Expressing the sense of Congress that the 2008 Olympic Games should not be held in Beijing unless the Government of the People's Republic of China releases all political prisoners, ratifies the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and observes internationally recognized human rights.	No. 14
H. Res. 130 May 3	Mr. Goss (Rules). Rept. 107–54	Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules.	19
H. Res. 141 May 15	Ms. Pryce of Ohio (Rules). Rept. 107–67	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes.	25
H. Res. 143 May 16	Ms. Pryce of Ohio (Rules). Rept. 107–69	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.	27

2001			No.

3. PRIVATE CALENDAR

SEC. 3

Rule XIII, clause 1(a):

“(3) A Private Calendar as provided in clause 5 of rule XV, to which shall be referred all private bills and private resolutions.”

Rule XV, clause 5:

“5. (a) On the first Tuesday of a month, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar after disposal of such business on the Speaker’s table as requires reference only. If two or more Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner object to the consideration of a bill or resolution so called, it shall be recommitted to the committee that reported it. No other business shall be in order before completion of the call of the Private Calendar on this day unless two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present, agree to a motion that the House dispense with the call.

“(b)(1) On the third Tuesday of month, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker’s table as requires reference only, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar. Preference shall be given to omnibus bills containing the texts of bills or resolutions that have previously been objected to on a call of the Private Calendar. If two or more Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner object to the consideration of a bill or resolution so called (other than on omnibus bill), it shall be recommitted to the committee that reported it. Two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present, may adopt a motion that the House dispense with the call on this day.

“(2) Omnibus bills shall be read for amendment by paragraph. No amendment shall be in order except to strike or to reduce amounts of money or to provide limitations. An item or matter stricken from an omnibus bill may not thereafter during the same session of Congress be included in an omnibus bill. Upon passage such an omnibus bill shall be resolved into the several bills and resolutions of which it is composed. The several bills and resolutions, with any amendments adopted by the House, shall be engrossed, when necessary, and otherwise considered as passed severally by the House as distinct bills and resolutions.

“(c) The Speaker may not entertain a reservation of the right to object to the consideration of a bill or resolution under this clause. A bill or resolution considered under this clause shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. A motion to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar under this clause shall be privileged. Debate on such a motion shall be limited to five minutes in support and five minutes in opposition.”

2001 H.R. 392 Apr. 20	Mr. Sensenbrenner (Judiciary). Rept. 107–44	For the relief of Nancy B. Wilson.	No. 1
-----------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

2001			No.

4. CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Rule XIII, clause 1:

“(b) There is established a Corrections Calendar as provided in clause 6 of rule XV.”

Rule XV, clause 6:

“6. (a) After a bill has been favorably reported and placed on either the Union or House Calendar, the Speaker, after consultation with the Minority leader, may direct the Clerk also to place the bill on the “Corrections Calendar.” At any time on the second and fourth Tuesdays of a month, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call a bill that is printed on the Corrections Calendar.

“(b) A bill called from the Corrections Calendar shall be considered in the House, is debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction, and shall not be subject to amendment except those recommended by the primary committee of jurisdiction or offered by the chairman of the primary committee or a designee. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

“(c) The approval of three-fifths of the Members voting, a quorum being present, shall be required to pass a bill called from the Corrections Calendar. The rejection of a bill so called, or the sustaining of a point of order against it or against its consideration, does not cause its removal from the Calendar to which it was originally referred.”

SEC. 4

2001			No.
------	--	--	-----

			No.

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES

Rule XV, clause 2:

“2. (a) Motions to discharge committees shall be in order on the second and fourth Mondays of a month.

“(b)(1) A Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge—

“(A) a committee from consideration of a public bill or public resolution that has been referred to it for 30 legislative days; or

“(B) the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution that has been referred to it for seven legislative days and that proposes a special order of business for the consideration of a public bill or public resolution that has been reported by a standing committee or has been referred to a standing committee for 30 legislative days.

“(2) Only one motion may be presented for a bill or resolution. A Member may not file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution providing for the consideration of more than one public bill or public resolution or admitting or effecting a nongermane amendment to a public bill or public resolution.

“(c) A motion presented under paragraph (b) shall be placed in the custody of the Clerk, who shall arrange a convenient place for the signatures of Members. A signature may be withdrawn by a Member in writing at any time before a motion is entered on the Journal. The Clerk shall make signatures a matter of public record, causing the names of the Members who have signed a discharge motion during a week to be published in a portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose on the last legislative day of the week and making cumulative lists of such names available each day for public inspection in an appropriate office of the House. The Clerk shall devise a means for making such lists available to offices of the House and to the public in electronic form. When a majority of the total membership of the House shall have signed the motion, it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the signatures thereto in the Record, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees.

“(d)(1) On the second and fourth Mondays of a month (except during the last six days of a session of Congress), immediately after the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, a motion to discharge that has been on the calendar for at least seven legislative days shall be privileged if called up by a Member whose signature appears thereon. When such a motion is called up, the House shall proceed to its consideration under this paragraph without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn. Privileged motions to discharge shall have precedence in the order of their entry on the Journal.

“(2) When a motion to discharge is called up, the bill or resolution to which it relates shall be read by title only. The motion is debatable for 20 minutes, one-half in favor of the motion and one-half in opposition thereto.

“(e)(1) If a motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution, the House shall immediately consider the resolution, pending which the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn. After the result of such a motion to adjourn is announced, the Speaker may not entertain any other dilatory motion until the resolution has been disposed of. If the resolution is adopted, the House shall immediately proceed to its execution.

“(2) If a motion prevails to discharge a standing committee from consideration of a public bill or public resolution, a motion that the House proceed to the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution shall be privileged if offered by a Member whose signature appeared on the motion to discharge. The motion to proceed is not debatable. If the motion to proceed is adopted, the bill or resolution shall be considered immediately under the general rules of the House. If unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up, the bill or resolution shall remain the unfinished business until it is disposed of. If the motion to proceed is rejected, the bill or resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar, where it shall have the same status as if the committee from which it was discharged had duly reported it to the House.

“(f)(1) When a motion to discharge originated under this clause has once been acted on by the House, it shall not be in order to entertain during the same session of Congress—

“(A) a motion to discharge a committee from consideration of that bill or resolution or of any other bill or resolution that, by relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, is substantially the same; or

“(B) a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of that bill or resolution or of any other bill or resolution that, by relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, is substantially the same.

“(2) A motion to discharge on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees that is rendered out of order under subparagraph (1) shall be stricken from that calendar.”

SEC. 5

Motion No. and date entered	Title	Committee	Motion filed by—	Cal- endar No.
2001				

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES

Motion No. and date entered	Title	Committee	Motion filed by—	Cal- endar No.

PUBLIC LAWS

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.
FIRST SESSION					
107-1	H.J. Res. 7				
107-2	H.R. 559				
107-3	S. 279				
107-4	H.J. Res. 19				
107-5	S.J. Res. 6				
107-6	H.R. 132				
107-7	H.R. 395				
107-8	H.R. 256				

SEC. 6

PUBLIC LAWS

LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.
FIRST SESSION—Continued					

PRIVATE LAWS

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.
FIRST SESSION					

SEC. 7




PRIVATE LAWS

LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.	LAW NO.	BILL NO.
FIRST SESSION—Continued					

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Numerical order of bills and resolutions which have been reported to or considered by either or both Houses.

NOTE. Similar or identical bills, and bills having reference to each other, are indicated by number in parentheses.

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS		HOUSE BILLS—Continued	
H.R. 1 (H. Res. 143) (S. 1).—To close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind. Referred to Education and the Workforce Mar. 23, 2001. Reported amended May 14, 2001; Rept. 107–63, Pt. I. Referred to the Judiciary May 14, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 15, 2001. The Judiciary discharged May 15, 2001. Union CalendarUnion 38		H.R. 10 (H. Res. 127).—To provide for pension reform, and for other purposes. Referred to Ways and Means and in addition to Education and the Workforce Mar. 14, 2001. Reported amended from Ways and Means May 1, 2001; Rept. 107–51, Pt. I. Reported amended from Education and the Workforce May 1, 2001; Pt. II. Union Calendar. Passed House amended May 2, 2001; Roll No. 96: 407–24. Received in Senate May 3, 2001.	
H.R. 2.—To establish a procedure to safeguard the combined surpluses of the Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds. Referred to Rules and in addition to the Budget Feb. 8, 2001. Rereferred to the Budget and in addition to Rules Feb. 13, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Feb. 13, 2001; Roll No. 13: 407–2. Received in Senate and referred to Finance Feb. 14, 2001. Finance discharged Feb. 15, 2001. Referred jointly to the Budget and Governmental Affairs Feb. 15, 2001.		H.R. 90.—To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit telemarketers from interfering with the caller identification service of any person to whom a telephone solicitation is made, and for other purposes. Referred to Energy and Commerce Jan. 3, 2001. Reported Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107–13. Union CalendarUnion 8	SEC. 8 
H.R. 3 (H. Res. 83).—To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income tax rates. Referred to Ways and Means Feb. 28, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107–7. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Mar. 8, 2001; Roll No. 45: 230–198. Received in Senate and referred to Finance Mar. 9, 2001.		H.R. 93.—To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the mandatory separation age for Federal firefighters be made the same as the age that applies with respect to Federal law enforcement officers. Referred to Government Reform Jan. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Jan. 30, 2001; Roll No. 5: 401–0. Received in Senate and referred to Governmental Affairs Jan. 31, 2001.	
H.R. 6 (H. Res. 104).—To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the nonrefundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability. Referred to Ways and Means Mar. 15, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 27, 2001; Rept. 107–29. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Mar. 29, 2001; Roll No. 75: 282–144. Received in Senate Mar. 29, 2001.		H.R. 132.—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the “Goro Hokama Post Office Building”. Referred to Government Reform Jan. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 7, 2001; Roll No. 11: 413–0. Received in Senate Feb. 7, 2001. Passed Senate Mar. 21, 2001. Presented to the President Apr. 5, 2001. Approved Apr. 12, 2001. Public Law 107–6.	
H.R. 8 (H. Res. 111).—To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and for other purposes. Referred to Ways and Means Mar. 14, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107–37. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Apr. 4, 2001; Roll No. 84: 274–154. Received in Senate Apr. 5, 2001. Ordered placed on the calendar Apr. 6, 2001.		H.R. 146.—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes. Referred to Resources Jan. 3, 2001. Reported Apr. 24, 2001; Rept. 107–47. Union Calendar. Passed House May 9, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources May 10, 2001.	
		H.R. 182.—To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Eight Mile River in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes. Referred to Resources Jan. 3, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107–36. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 1, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources May 2, 2001.	

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued		HOUSE BILLS—Continued	
H.R. 223.—	To amend the Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993 to provide additional time for Clear Creek County to dispose of certain lands transferred to the county under the Act. Referred to Resources Jan. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 13, 2001; Roll No. 47: 413-0. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources Mar. 14, 2001.	H.R. 364.—	To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the “Marjory Williams Scrivens Post Office”. Referred to Government Reform Jan. 31, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Governmental Affairs Mar. 15, 2001.
H.R. 247 (H. Res. 93).—	To amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks. Referred to Financial Services Jan. 30, 2001. Passed House amended Mar. 22, 2001; Roll No. 61: 401-6. Received in Senate and referred to Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Mar. 22, 2001.	H.R. 392.—	For the relief of Nancy B. Wilson. Referred to the Judiciary Jan. 31, 2001. Reported Apr. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-44. Private CalendarPrivate 1
H.R. 256.—	To extend for 11 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted. Referred to the Judiciary Jan. 30, 2001. Reported Feb. 26, 2001; Rept. 107-2. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001; Roll No. 17: 408-2. Received in Senate Mar. 1, 2001. Passed Senate Apr. 26, 2001. Presented to the President May 2, 2001. Approved May 11, 2001. Public Law 107-8.	H.R. 395.—	To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida, as the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida”. Referred to Government Reform Feb. 6, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 6, 2001. Received in Senate Feb. 7, 2001. Passed Senate Mar. 21, 2001. Presented to the President Apr. 5, 2001. Approved Apr. 12, 2001. Public Law 107-7.
H.R. 308.—	To establish the Guam War Claims Review Commission. Referred to Resources Jan. 30, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 13, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources Mar. 14, 2001.	H.R. 428.—	Concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization. Referred to International Relations Feb. 6, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Apr. 24, 2001; Roll No. 86: 407-0. Received in Senate and referred to Foreign Relations Apr. 25, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate with amendment May 9, 2001. House agreed to Senate amendment under suspension of the rules May 15, 2001; Roll No. 113: 415-0.
H.R. 309.—	To provide for the determination of withholding tax rates under the Guam income tax. Referred to Resources Jan. 30, 2001. Reported Apr. 24, 2001; Rept. 107-48. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House May 1, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources May 2, 2001.	H.R. 496.—	To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to promote deployment of advanced services and foster the development of competition for the benefit of consumers in all regions of the Nation by relieving unnecessary burdens on the Nation’s two percent local exchange telecommunications carriers, and for other purposes. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 7, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 13, 2001; Rept. 107-20. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 21, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Mar. 22, 2001.
H.R. 327 (H. Res. 89).—	To amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements and to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses. Referred to Government Reform and in addition to Small Business Jan. 31, 2001. Passed House amended Mar. 15, 2001; Roll No. 50: 418-0. Received in Senate and referred to Governmental Affairs Mar. 15, 2001.	H.R. 503 (H. Res. 119).—	To amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary and in addition to Armed Services Feb. 7, 2001. Reported from the Judiciary Apr. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-42, Pt. I. Referral to Armed Services extended Apr. 20, 2001 for a period ending not later than Apr. 24, 2001. Armed Services discharged. Apr. 24, 2001. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Apr. 26, 2001; Roll No. 89: 252-172. Received in Senate Apr. 26, 2001.
H.R. 333 (H. Res. 71) (S. 220) (S. 420).—	To amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary and in addition to Financial Services Jan. 31, 2001. Reported amended from the Judiciary Feb. 26, 2001; Rept. 107-3, Pt. I. Referral to Financial Services extended Feb. 26, 2001 for a period ending not later than Feb. 26, 2001. Financial Services discharged. Feb. 26, 2001. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Mar. 1, 2001; Roll No. 25: 306-108. Received in Senate and ordered placed on the calendar Mar. 5, 2001.		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued		HOUSE BILLS—Continued	
H.R. 524.	—To require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to successfully integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices, and to authorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assess critical enterprise integration standards and implementation activities for major manufacturing industries and to develop a plan for enterprise integration for each major manufacturing industry. Referred to Science Feb. 8, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001; Roll No. 14: 409-6. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Feb. 14, 2001.	H.R. 601.	—To ensure the continued access of hunters to those Federal lands included within the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument in the State of Idaho pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 7373 of November 9, 2000, and to continue the applicability of the Taylor Grazing Act to the disposition of grazing fees arising from the use of such lands, and for other purposes. Referred to Resources Feb. 13, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-34. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 1, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources May 2, 2001.
H.R. 554 (H. Res. 36).	—To establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Feb. 12, 2001. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001; Roll No. 15: 404-4. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Feb. 14, 2001.	H.R. 621.	—To designate the Federal building located at 6230 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the "James C. Corman Federal Building". Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Feb. 14, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001; Roll No. 19: 413-0. Received in Senate and referred to Environment and Public Works Mar. 1, 2001.
H.R. 558.	—To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse". Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Feb. 12, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001; Roll No. 18: 412-0. Received in Senate and referred to Environment and Public Works Mar. 1, 2001.	H.R. 622 (H. Res. 141).	—To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes. Referred to Ways and Means Feb. 14, 2001. Reported amended May 15, 2001; Rept. 107-64. Union CalendarUnion 35
H.R. 559.	—To designate the United States courthouse located at 1 Courthouse Way in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse". Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Feb. 13, 2001. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001. Received in Senate Feb. 14, 2001. Passed Senate Feb. 15, 2001. Presented to the President Mar. 1, 2001. Approved Mar. 13, 2001. Public Law 107-2.	H.R. 624.	—To amend the Public Health Service Act to promote organ donation. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 14, 2001. Reported Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107-11. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 7, 2001; Roll No. 31: 404-0. Received in Senate and referred to Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Mar. 8, 2001.
H.R. 581 (H. Res. 135).	—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management. Referred to Resources Feb. 13, 2001. Reported Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-35. Union Calendar. Passed House amended May 9, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Environment and Public Works May 10, 2001.	H.R. 642.	—To reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes. Referred to Resources Feb. 14, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-33. Union Calendar. Considered under suspension of rules Apr. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Apr. 4, 2001; Roll No. 81: 406-13. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Apr. 5, 2001.
H.R. 586.	—To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion from gross income for foster care payments shall also apply to payments by qualified placement agencies, and for other purposes. Referred to Ways and Means Feb. 13, 2001. Reported amended May 15, 2001; Rept. 107-66. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 15, 2001; Roll No. 112: 420-0.	H.R. 718.	—To protect individuals, families, and Internet service providers from unsolicited and unwanted electronic mail. Referred to Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Judiciary Feb. 14, 2001. Reported amended from Energy and Commerce Apr. 4, 2001; Rept. 107-41, Pt. I. Referral to the Judiciary extended Apr. 4, 2001 for a period ending not later than June 5, 2001.
		H.R. 724.	—To authorize appropriations to carry out part B of title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, relating to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 26, 2001. Reported Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107-6. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 6, 2001; Roll No. 26: 400-2. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources Mar. 7, 2001.

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued		HOUSE BILLS—Continued	
H.R. 725.	—To establish a toll free number under the Federal Trade Commission to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 26, 2001. Reported Mar. 13, 2001; Rept. 107-21. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 14, 2001; Roll No. 48: 407-3. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Mar. 15, 2001.	H.R. 809.	—To make technical corrections to various anti-trust laws and to references to such laws. Referred to the Judiciary and in addition to Armed Services Mar. 1, 2001. Reported from the Judiciary Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-17, Pt. I. Referral to Armed Services extended Mar. 12, 2001 for a period ending not later than Mar. 12, 2001. Armed Services discharged. Mar. 12, 2001. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 15, 2001.
H.R. 727.	—To amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to provide that low-speed electric bicycles are consumer products subject to such Act. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 27, 2001. Reported Mar. 5, 2001; Rept. 107-5. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 6, 2001; Roll No. 27: 401-1. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Mar. 7, 2001.	H.R. 811.	—To authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out construction projects for the purpose of improving, renovating, and updating patient care facilities at Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers. Referred to Veterans' Affairs Mar. 1, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 26, 2001; Rept. 107-28. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 27, 2001; Roll No. 64: 417-0. Received in Senate and referred to Veterans' Affairs Mar. 28, 2001.
H.R. 741.	—To amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary Feb. 27, 2001. Reported Mar. 13, 2001; Rept. 107-19. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 15, 2001.	H.R. 821.	—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1030 South Church Street in Asheboro, North Carolina, as the "W. Joe Trogdon Post Office Building". Referred to Government Reform Mar. 1, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Governmental Affairs Mar. 15, 2001.
H.R. 768.	—To amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to make permanent the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws. Referred to the Judiciary Feb. 28, 2001. Reported Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-32. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Apr. 3, 2001; Roll No. 76: 414-0. Received in Senate and referred to Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Apr. 4, 2001.	H.R. 834.	—To amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails in the System, and for other purposes. Referred to Resources Mar. 1, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 13, 2001; Roll No. 46: 409-3. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources Mar. 14, 2001.
H.R. 801.	—To amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs of educational assistance, to expand programs of transition assistance and outreach to departing servicemembers, veterans, and dependents, to increase burial benefits, to provide for family coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, and for other purposes. Referred to Veterans' Affairs Feb. 28, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 26, 2001; Rept. 107-27. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 27, 2001; Roll No. 63: 417-0. Received in Senate and referred to Veterans' Affairs Mar. 28, 2001.	H.R. 860.	—To amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions. Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 6, 2001. Reported Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-14. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 15, 2001.
H.R. 802 (S. 39).	—To authorize the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary Feb. 28, 2001. Reported Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-15. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 22, 2001; Roll No. 59: 414-0. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 22, 2001. Reported May 10, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate May 14, 2001.	H.R. 861.	—To make technical amendments to section 10 of title 9, United States Code. Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 6, 2001. Reported Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-16. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001; Roll No. 49: 413-0. Received in Senate and referred to Armed Services Mar. 15, 2001.
		H.R. 863.	—To provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders. Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 6, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-46. Union CalendarUnion 29
		H.R. 880.	—To provide for the acquisition of property in Washington County, Utah, for implementation of a desert tortoise habitat conservation plan. Referred to Resources Mar. 6, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 13, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Energy and Natural Resources Mar. 14, 2001.

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued		HOUSE BILLS—Continued	
H.R. 974.	—To increase the number of interaccount transfers which may be made from business accounts at depository institutions, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserves, and for other purposes. Referred to Financial Services Mar. 13, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-38. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Apr. 3, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Apr. 4, 2001.	H.R. 1646 (H. Res. 138).	—To authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes. Referred to International Relations Apr. 27, 2001. Reported amended May 4, 2001; Rept. 107-57. Union Calendar. Considered May 10, 2001. Passed House amended May 16, 2001; Roll No. 121: 352-73.
H.R. 981.	—To provide a biennial budget for the United States Government. Referred to the Budget and in addition to Rules, and Government Reform Mar. 13, 2001. Referral to the Budget extended Apr. 4, 2001 for a period ending not later than Sept. 5, 2001.	H.R. 1696.	—To expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia. Referred to Resources and in addition to Veterans' Affairs May 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House May 15, 2001; Roll No. 109: 400-15.
H.R. 1042.	—To prevent the elimination of certain reports. Referred to Science Mar. 15, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 21, 2001; Roll No. 54: 414-2. Received in Senate and referred to Governmental Affairs Mar. 22, 2001.	H.R. 1727.	—To amend the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 to provide for consistent treatment of survivor benefits for public safety officers killed in the line of duty. Referred to Ways and Means May 3, 2001. Reported amended May 15, 2001; Rept. 107-65. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 15, 2001; Roll No. 111: 419-0.
H.R. 1088.	—To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce fees collected by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes. Referred to Financial Services Mar. 19, 2001. Reported amended May 1, 2001; Rept. 107-52, Pt. I. Referred to Government Reform May 1, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 2, 2001. Referral extended May 2, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 8, 2001. Referral extended May 8, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 9, 2001. Referral extended May 9, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 10, 2001. Referral extended May 10, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 18, 2001.	H.R. 1836 (H. Res. 142).	—To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002. Referred to Ways and Means May 15, 2001. Passed House May 16, 2001; Roll No. 118: 230-197.
H.R. 1098.	—To improve the recording and discharging of maritime liens and expand the American Merchant Marine Memorial Wall of Honor, and for other purposes. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Mar. 20, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 21, 2001; Roll No. 55: 415-3. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Mar. 22, 2001.		
H.R. 1099.	—To make changes in laws governing Coast Guard personnel, increase marine safety, renew certain groups that advise the Coast Guard on safety issues, make miscellaneous improvements to Coast Guard operations and policies, and for other purposes. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Mar. 20, 2001. Considered under suspension of rules Mar. 21, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 22, 2001; Roll No. 58: 415-0. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Mar. 22, 2001.		
H.R. 1209.	—To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 26, 2001. Reported Apr. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-45.		
Union CalendarUnion 28		

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued			

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

8-7

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued			

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued			

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS			
	<p>H.J. Res. 7.—Recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan. Referred to Government Reform Jan. 31, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 6, 2001; Roll No. 9: 410-0. Received in Senate and passed Feb. 6, 2001. Presented to the President Feb. 7, 2001. Approved Feb. 15, 2001. Public Law 107-1.</p> <p>H.J. Res. 19.—Providing for the appointment of Walter E. Massey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Referred to House Administration Feb. 13, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001. Received in Senate and passed Mar. 1, 2001. Presented to the President Mar. 8, 2001. Approved Mar. 16, 2001. Public Law 107-4.</p> <p>H.J. Res. 41 (H. Res. 118).—Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 22, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-43. House Calendar. Failed of passage (two-thirds required) Apr. 25, 2001; Roll No. 87: 232-189.</p>		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS—Continued			

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS		HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
H. Con. Res. 1.—	Providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001. Received in Senate Jan. 3, 2001. Passed Senate Jan. 4 (Legislative day of Jan. 3), 2001.	H. Con. Res. 41.—	Expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquakes that struck El Salvador on January 13, 2001, and February 13, 2001, and supporting ongoing aid efforts. Referred to International Relations and in addition to Financial Services Feb. 27, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 20, 2001; Roll No. 52: 405-1. Received in Senate and referred to Foreign Relations Mar. 21, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 14.—	Permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Referred to House Administration Jan. 30, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Jan. 31, 2001; Roll No. 6: 407-0. Received in Senate and referred to Rules and Administration Jan. 31, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate with amendment Feb. 8, 2001. House agreed to Senate amendment Feb. 27, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 43.—	Authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1989". Referred to House Administration Feb. 27, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 21, 2001; Roll No. 53: 414-1. Received in Senate and referred to Rules and Administration Mar. 22, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate Apr. 6, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 15 (S. Con. Res. 6).—	Expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and support for ongoing aid efforts. Referred to International Relations and in addition to Financial Services Jan. 30, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Jan. 31, 2001; Roll No. 7: 406-1. Received in Senate and referred to Foreign Relations Jan. 31, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 47 (S. Con. Res. 22).—	Honoring the 21 members of the National Guard who were killed in the crash of a National Guard aircraft on March 3, 2001, in south-central Georgia. Referred to Armed Services Mar. 6, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 7, 2001; Roll No. 32: 413-0. Received in Senate and passed Mar. 8, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 18.—	Providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives. Passed House Jan. 31, 2001. Received in Senate and passed Jan. 31, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 57.—	Condemning the heinous atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, at Santana High School in Santee, California. Referred to Education and the Workforce Mar. 8, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 13, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 14, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 27.—	Honoring the National Institute of Standards and Technology and its employees for 100 years of service to the Nation. Referred to Science Feb. 13, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001; Roll No. 20: 413-1. Received in Senate and passed Mar. 1, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 59.—	Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment of National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week. Referred to Government Reform Mar. 8, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Apr. 3, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Apr. 4, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 28.—	Providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President. Passed House Feb. 13, 2001. Received in Senate and passed Feb. 14, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 66.—	Authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Women in Congress, 1917-1990". Referred to House Administration Mar. 15, 2001. Considered under suspension of rules Apr. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Apr. 4, 2001; Roll No. 79: 414-1. Received in Senate and referred to Rules and Administration Apr. 5, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate Apr. 24, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 31 (S. Con. Res. 12).—	Expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation and supporting National Donor Day. Referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 13, 2001. Reported Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107-10. House Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House Mar. 7, 2001; Roll No. 30: 418-0. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Mar. 8, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 69.—	Expressing the sense of the Congress on the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and urging all Contracting States to the Convention to recommend the production of practice guides. Referred to International Relations Mar. 20, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed House amended Mar. 22, 2001. Received in Senate Mar. 22, 2001. Passed Senate Mar. 23, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 32.—	Providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001. Received in Senate and passed Feb. 14, 2001.		
H. Con. Res. 39.—	Honoring the ultimate sacrifice made by 28 United States soldiers killed by an Iraqi missile attack on February 25, 1991, during Operation Desert Storm, and resolving to support appropriate and effective theater missile defense programs. Referred to Armed Services Feb. 27, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 27, 2001; Roll No. 16: 395-0. Received in Senate and referred to Armed Services Feb. 28, 2001.		

SEC. 10

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS—Continued		HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
H. Con. Res. 73.	—Expressing the sense of Congress that the 2008 Olympic Games should not be held in Beijing unless the Government of the People's Republic of China releases all political prisoners, ratifies the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and observes internationally recognized human rights. Referred to International Relations Mar. 21, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 4, 2001; Rept. 107-40. House CalendarHouse 14	H. Con. Res. 108.	—Honoring the National Science Foundation for 50 years of service to the Nation. Referred to Science Apr. 25, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House May 8, 2001. Received in Senate and passed May 9, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 74.	—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Mar. 21, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House May 8, 2001. Received in Senate and passed May 9, 2001.	H. Con. Res. 110.	—Expressing the sense of the Congress in support of National Children's Memorial Flag Day. Referred to Education and the Workforce Apr. 26, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed House Apr. 26, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary Apr. 26, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 83 (H. Res. 100) (H. Res. 134) (H. Res. 136) (S. Con. Res. 20).	—Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. Reported from the Budget Mar. 23, 2001; Rept. 107-26. Union Calendar. Passed House amended Mar. 28, 2001; Roll No. 70: 222-205. Received in Senate and referred to the Budget Mar. 28, 2001. Committee discharged. Ordered placed on the calendar Apr. 2 (Legislative day of Mar. 30), 2001. Considered Apr. 2 (Legislative day of Mar. 30), 3, 4, 5, 2001. Passed Senate with amendment Apr. 6, 2001; Roll No. 86: 65-35. Senate insisted on its amendment and asked for a conference Apr. 23, 2001. House disagreed to Senate amendment and agreed to a conference Apr. 24, 2001. Conference report filed in the House May 3, 2001; Rept. 107-55. House recommitted the conference report pursuant to H. Res. 134 May 8, 2001. Conference report filed in the House May 8, 2001; Rept. 107-60. House agreed to conference report May 9, 2001; Roll No. 104: 221-207. Conference report considered in Senate May 9, 2001. Senate agreed to conference report May 10, 2001; Roll No. 98: 53-47.	H. Con. Res. 117.	—Expressing sympathy to the family, friends, and co-workers of Veronica "Roni" Bowers and Charity Bowers. Referred to International Relations May 1, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed House May 1, 2001. Received in Senate and referred to Foreign Relations May 2, 2001.
H. Con. Res. 91.	—Recognizing the importance of increasing awareness of the autism spectrum disorder, and supporting programs for greater research and improved treatment of autism and improved training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for them. Referred to Energy and Commerce and in addition to Education and the Workforce Mar. 29, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House May 1, 2001; Roll No. 90: 418-1. Received in Senate and referred to Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions May 2, 2001.		
H. Con. Res. 93.	—Providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. Passed House Apr. 3, 2001. Received in Senate and passed Apr. 4, 2001.		
H. Con. Res. 95.	—Supporting a National Charter Schools Week. Referred to Education and the Workforce Apr. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 1, 2001; Roll No. 91: 404-6. Received in Senate and referred to the Judiciary May 2, 2001.		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE RESOLUTIONS		HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
H. Res. 1.—	Electing officers of the House of Representatives. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 32.—	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Feb. 8, 2001.
H. Res. 2.—	To inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled and of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 33.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Feb. 8, 2001.
H. Res. 3.—	Authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 34.—	Congratulating the Prime Minister-elect of Israel, Ariel Sharon, calling for an end to violence in the Middle East, reaffirming the friendship between the Governments of the United States and Israel, and for other purposes. Referred to International Relations Feb. 8, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Feb. 13, 2001; Roll No. 12: 410-1.
H. Res. 4.—	Authorizing the Clerk to inform the President of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 36 (H.R. 554).—	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents. Reported from Rules Feb. 13, 2001; Rept. 107-1. House Calendar. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001.
H. Res. 5.—	Adopting rules for the One Hundred Seventh Congress. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001; Roll No. 4: 215-206.	H. Res. 37.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Feb. 13, 2001.
H. Res. 6.—	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 54.—	Commemorating African American pioneers in Colorado. Referred to Resources Feb. 26, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001; Roll No. 21: 411-0.
H. Res. 7.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 55.—	Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a day of celebration in honor of Dr. Dorothy Irene Height. Referred to Government Reform Feb. 26, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 27, 2001.
H. Res. 8.—	Providing for the designation of certain minority employees. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 56.—	Urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce at the annual meeting of the Commission a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet, and for other purposes. Referred to International Relations Feb. 26, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Apr. 3, 2001; Roll No. 78: 406-6.
H. Res. 9.—	Fixing the daily hour of meeting of the First Session of the One Hundred Seventh Congress. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 57.—	Recognizing and honoring Dale Earnhardt and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on his death. Referred to Government Reform Feb. 27, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 27, 2001.
H. Res. 10.—	Providing for the attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States. Passed House Jan. 3, 2001.	H. Res. 63.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. Passed House Feb. 27, 2001.
H. Res. 19.—	Electing Members to serve on standing committees of the House of Representatives. Passed House Jan. 6, 2001.	H. Res. 67.—	Recognizing the importance of combatting tuberculosis on a worldwide basis, and acknowledging the severe impact that TB has on minority populations in the United States. Referred to International Relations and in addition to Energy and Commerce Feb. 27, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended Mar. 20, 2001; Roll No. 51: 405-2.
H. Res. 20.—	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Jan. 6, 2001.		
H. Res. 21.—	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Jan. 20, 2001.		
H. Res. 22.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Jan. 20, 2001.		
H. Res. 24.—	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. Passed House Jan. 31, 2001.		
H. Res. 25.—	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. Passed House Jan. 31, 2001.		
H. Res. 28.—	Honoring the contributions of Catholic schools. Referred to Education and the Workforce Feb. 6, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Feb. 6, 2001; Roll No. 10: 412-0.		

SEC. 11

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued		HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
H. Res. 69.	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001.	H. Res. 89 (H.R. 327).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 327) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements and to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses. Reported from Rules Mar. 14, 2001; Rept. 107-22. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 15, 2001.
H. Res. 70.	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Feb. 28, 2001.	H. Res. 90.	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001.
H. Res. 71 (H.R. 333).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 333) to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules Feb. 28, 2001; Rept. 107-4. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 1, 2001; Roll No. 22: 281-132.	H. Res. 91.	Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the human rights situation in Cuba. Referred to International Relations Mar. 19, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Apr. 3, 2001; Roll No. 77: 347-44.
H. Res. 76.	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 6, 2001.	H. Res. 92.	Providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules. Reported from Rules Mar. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-23. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 21, 2001.
H. Res. 77.	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 6, 2001.	H. Res. 93 (H.R. 247).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 247) to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks. Reported from Rules Mar. 20, 2001; Rept. 107-24. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 22, 2001; Roll No. 57: 246-169.
H. Res. 78.	Providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules. Reported from Rules Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107-8. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 7, 2001.	H. Res. 100 (H. Con. Res. 83).	Providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. Reported from Rules Mar. 27, 2001; Rept. 107-30. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 28, 2001; Roll No. 65: 282-130.
H. Res. 79 (S.J. Res. 6).	Providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 6) providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, relating to ergonomics. Reported from Rules Mar. 6, 2001; Rept. 107-9. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 7, 2001; Roll No. 29: 222-198.	H. Res. 104 (H.R. 6).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the nonrefundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability. Reported from Rules Mar. 28, 2001; Rept. 107-31. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 29, 2001; Roll No. 71: 249-171.
H. Res. 82.	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 7, 2001.	H. Res. 107.	Expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Norman Sisisky, a Representative from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Passed House Mar. 29, 2001.
H. Res. 83 (H.R. 3).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income tax rates. Reported from Rules Mar. 7, 2001; Rept. 107-12. House Calendar. Passed House Mar. 8, 2001; Roll No. 39: 220-204.	H. Res. 111 (H.R. 8).	Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules Apr. 3, 2001; Rept. 107-39. House Calendar. Passed House Apr. 4, 2001; Roll No. 80: 413-12.
H. Res. 84.	Providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Seventh Congress. Referred to House Administration Mar. 7, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 23, 2001; Rept. 107-25. House Calendar. Passed House amended Mar. 27, 2001; Roll No. 62: 357-61.		
H. Res. 85.	Designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 8, 2001.		
H. Res. 88.	Designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House. Passed House Mar. 14, 2001.		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued		HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
H. Res. 112.	—Recognizing the upcoming 100th anniversary of the 4-H Youth Development Program and commending such program for service to the youth of the world. Referred to Education and the Workforce Apr. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House May 1, 2001.	H. Res. 134 (H. Con. Res. 83).	—Providing for recom-mittal of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary lev-els for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. Re-ported from Rules May 8, 2001; Rept. 107–58. House Calendar. Passed House May 8, 2001; Roll No. 101: 409–1.
H. Res. 113.	—Urging the House of Representatives to support events such as the “Increase the Peace Day”. Referred to Education and the Workforce Apr. 3, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House Apr. 24, 2001.	H. Res. 135 (H.R. 581).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the De-partment of the Interior and Related Agencies App-ro-priations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency coopera-tion required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management. Reported from Rules May 8, 2001; Rept. 107–59. House Calendar. Passed House May 9, 2001.
H. Res. 116.	—Commemorating the dedication and sac-rifices of the men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law en-for-cement officers. Referred to Government Reform Apr. 4, 2001. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 15, 2001; Roll No. 110: 416–0.	H. Res. 136 (H. Con. Res. 83).	—Waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concur-rent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the con-gressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. Reported from Rules May 8, 2001; Rept. 107–61. House Calendar. Passed House May 9, 2001; Roll No. 103: 218–208.
H. Res. 118 (H.J. Res. 41).	—Providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations.. Reported from Rules Apr. 24, 2001; Rept. 107–49. House Calendar. Passed House Apr. 25, 2001.	H. Res. 138 (H.R. 1646).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules May 9, 2001; Rept. 107–62. House Calendar. Passed House May 10, 2001; Roll No. 105: 226–192.
H. Res. 119 (H.R. 503).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules Apr. 24, 2001; Rept. 107–50. House Calendar. Passed House Apr. 26, 2001.	H. Res. 141 (H.R. 622).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules May 15, 2001; Rept. 107–67. House CalendarHouse 25
H. Res. 127 (H.R. 10).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes. Reported from Rules May 1, 2001; Rept. 107–53. House Calendar. Passed House May 2, 2001; Roll No. 92: 404–24.	H. Res. 142 (H.R. 1836).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1836) to provide for reconciliation pursu-ant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002. Reported from Rules May 15, 2001; Rept. 107–68. House Calendar. Passed House May 16, 2001; Roll No. 116: 220–207.
H. Res. 129.	—Designating minority membership on cer-tain standing committees of the House. Passed House May 2, 2001.	H. Res. 143 (H.R. 1).	—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with account-ability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind. Reported from Rules May 16, 2001; Rept. 107–69. House CalendarHouse 27
H. Res. 130.	—Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain reso-lutions reported from the Committee on Rules. Re-ported from Rules May 3 (Legislative day of May 2), 2001; Rept. 107–54. House CalendarHouse 19		
H. Res. 131.	—Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain reso-lutions reported from the Committee on Rules. Re-ported from Rules May 4 (Legislative day of May 3), 2001; Rept. 107–56. House Calendar. Passed House May 8, 2001; Roll No. 100: 214–200.		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE RESOLUTIONS—Continued			

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE BILLS		SENATE BILLS—Continued	
S. 1 (H.R. 1).—To extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Reported from Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Mar. 28, 2001; Rept. 107-7. Considered May 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 2001.		S. 166.—To limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies. Referred to the Judiciary Jan. 24, 2001. Reported amended May 10, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate amended May 14, 2001. Received in House and referred to the Judiciary and in addition to Government Reform May 15, 2001.	
S. 27.—To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform. Referred to Rules and Administration Jan. 22, 2001. Committee discharged Mar. 19, 2001. Considered Mar. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 2001. Passed Senate amended Apr. 2 (Legislative day of Mar. 30), 2001; Roll No. 64: 59-41.		S. 206.—To repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2001, and for other purposes. Referred to Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Jan. 30, 2001. Reported amended May 9, 2001; Rept. 107-15.	
S. 39 (H.R. 802).—To provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty, and for other purposes. Referred to the Judiciary Jan. 22, 2001. Reported amended May 10, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate amended May 14, 2001. Received in House and held at desk May 15, 2001.		S. 219.—To suspend for two years the certification procedures under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to foster greater multilateral cooperation in international counternarcotics programs, and for other purposes. Referred to Foreign Relations Jan. 30, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 5, 2001; no written report.	
S. 73.—To prohibit the provision of Federal funds to any State or local educational agency that denies or prevents participation in constitutional prayer in schools. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.		S. 220 (H.R. 333) (S. 420).—To amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 31, 2001.	
S. 74.—To prohibit the provision of Federal funds to any State or local educational agency that distributes or provides morning-after pills to schoolchildren. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.		S. 235.—To provide for enhanced safety, public awareness, and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes. Ordered placed on the calendar Feb. 6, 2001. Passed Senate amended Feb. 8, 2001; Roll No. 11: 98-0. Received in House and held at desk Feb. 12, 2001. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure and in addition to Energy and Commerce Feb. 13, 2001.	
S. 75.—To protect the lives of unborn human beings. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.		S. 248.—To amend the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, to adjust a condition on the payment of arrearages to the United Nations that sets the maximum share of any United Nations peacekeeping operation's budget that may be assessed of any country. Referred to Foreign Relations Feb. 6, 2001. Reported Feb. 7, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate Feb. 7, 2001; Roll No. 10: 99-0. Received in House and referred to International Relations Feb. 8, 2001.	
S. 76.—To make it a violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States to perform an abortion with the knowledge that the abortion is being performed solely because of the gender of the fetus. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.		S. 279.—Affecting the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Senate Members of the Joint Economic Committee. Passed Senate Feb. 7, 2001. Received in House and held at desk Feb. 8, 2001. Passed House Feb. 14, 2001. Presented to the President Mar. 1, 2001. Approved Mar. 13, 2001. Public Law 107-3.	
S. 78.—To amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make preferential treatment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.		S. 295.—To provide emergency relief to small businesses affected by significant increases in the prices of heating oil, natural gas, propane, and kerosene, and for other purposes. Referred to Small Business Feb. 8, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 21, 2001; Rept. 107-4. Passed Senate amended Mar. 26, 2001. Received in House and referred to Small Business and in addition to Agriculture Mar. 27, 2001.	
S. 79.—To encourage drug-free and safe schools. Ordered placed on the calendar Jan. 23, 2001.			
S. 143.—To amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission, and for other purposes. Referred to Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Jan. 22, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 14, 2001; Rept. 107-3. Passed Senate amended Mar. 22, 2001.			
S. 149.—To provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes. Referred to Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Jan. 23, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 2 (Legislative day of Mar. 30), 2001; Rept. 107-10.			

SEC. 12

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE BILLS—Continued		SENATE BILLS—Continued	
S. 319.—	To amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that air carriers meet their obligations under the Airline Customer Service Agreement, and provide improved passenger service in order to meet public convenience and necessity. Referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Feb. 13, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 26, 2001; Rept. 107-13.	S. 718.—	To direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing drugs by athletes, and for other purposes. Referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation Apr. 5, 2001. Reported amended May 14, 2001; Rept. 107-16.
S. 320.—	To make technical corrections in patent, copyright, and trademark laws. Ordered placed on the calendar Feb. 13, 2001. Passed Senate Feb. 14, 2001; Roll No. 12: 98-0. Received in House and referred to the Judiciary Feb. 26, 2001. Reported with amendment Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-18. Union Calendar. Rules suspended. Passed House with amendment Mar. 14, 2001.	S. 763.—	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes. Reported from Finance Apr. 24, 2001; Rept. 107-12.
S. 328.—	To amend the Coastal Zone Management Act. Ordered placed on the calendar Feb. 15, 2001.	S. 872.—	To amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage. Ordered placed on the calendar May 15, 2001.
S. 350.—	To amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes. Referred to Environment and Public Works Feb. 15, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 12, 2001; Rept. 107-2. Passed Senate amended Apr. 25, 2001; Roll No. 87: 99-0. Received in House and referred to Energy and Commerce and in addition to Transportation and Infrastructure Apr. 26, 2001.		
S. 360.—	To honor Paul D. Coverdell. Passed Senate Feb. 15, 2001. Received in House and referred to International Relations and in addition to Education and the Workforce Feb. 26, 2001.		
S. 395.—	To ensure the independence and nonpartisan operation of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. Referred to Small Business Feb. 27, 2001. Reported amended Mar. 21, 2001; Rept. 107-5. Passed Senate amended Mar. 26, 2001. Received in House and referred to Small Business Mar. 27, 2001.		
S. 420 (H.R. 333) (S. 220).—	To amend title II, United States Code, and for other purposes. Reported from the Judiciary Mar. 1, 2001; no written report. Considered Mar. 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 2001. Passed Senate amended Mar. 15, 2001; Roll No. 36: 83-15. Received in House and held at desk Mar. 20, 2001.		
S. 560.—	For the relief of Rita Mirembe Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembe). Referred to the Judiciary Mar. 19, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate Apr. 30, 2001. Received in House and referred to the Judiciary May 1, 2001.		
S. 700.—	To establish a Federal interagency task force for the purpose of coordinating actions to prevent the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly known as “mad cow disease”) and foot-and-mouth disease in the United States. Ordered placed on the calendar and passed Senate amended Apr. 5, 2001. Received in House and held at desk Apr. 24, 2001. Passed House May 9, 2001.		

13-1

SEC. 13

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS—Continued			

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS		SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS—Continued	
S. Con. Res. 1.—	To provide for the counting on January 6, 2001, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States. Passed Senate Jan. 3, 2001. Received in House and passed Jan. 3, 2001.	S. Con. Res. 23.—	Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the involvement of the Government in Libya in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, and for other purposes. Referred to Foreign Relations Mar. 13, 2001. Reported Apr. 3, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate Apr. 6, 2001. Received in House and referred to International Relations Apr. 24, 2001.
S. Con. Res. 2.—	To extend the life of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies and the provisions of S. Con. Res. 90 of the One Hundred Sixth Congress. Passed Senate Jan. 3, 2001. Received in House and passed Jan. 3, 2001.	S. Con. Res. 25.—	Honoring the service of the 1,200 soldiers of the 48th Infantry Brigade of the Georgia Army National Guard as they deploy to Bosnia for nine months, recognizing their sacrifice while away from their jobs and families during that deployment, and recognizing the important role of all National Guard and Reserve personnel at home and abroad to the national security of the United States. Passed Senate Mar. 15, 2001. Received in House and referred to Armed Services Mar. 19, 2001.
S. Con. Res. 6 (H. Con. Res. 15).—	Expressing the sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and support for ongoing aid efforts. Referred to Foreign Relations Jan. 30, 2001. Reported Feb. 7, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate Feb. 8, 2001. Received in House and held at desk Feb. 12, 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 7.—	Expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to enhance national security and significantly further United States foreign policy and global competitiveness. Referred to Foreign Relations Feb. 1, 2001. Reported amended Apr. 4, 2001; no written report. Passed Senate amended Apr. 6, 2001. Received in House and referred to International Relations and in addition to Education and the Workforce Apr. 24, 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 12 (H. Con. Res. 31).—	Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation, and supporting National Donor Day. Passed Senate Feb. 14, 2001. Received in House and referred to Energy and Commerce Feb. 26, 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 13.—	Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the upcoming trip of President George W. Bush to Mexico to meet with the newly elected President Vicente Fox, and with respect to future cooperative efforts between the United States and Mexico. Passed Senate Feb. 14, 2001. Received in House and referred to International Relations Feb. 26, 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 18.—	Recognizing the achievements and contributions of the Peace Corps over the past 40 years, and for other purposes. Referred to Foreign Relations Feb. 27, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate Feb. 28, 2001. Received in House and referred to International Relations Mar. 1, 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 20 (H. Con. Res. 83).—	Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002. Referred to the Budget Mar. 5, 2001. Committee discharged. Ordered placed on the calendar Apr. 2 (Legislative day of Mar. 30), 2001.		
S. Con. Res. 22 (H. Con. Res. 47).—	Honoring the 21 members of the National Guard who were killed in the crash of a National Guard aircraft on March 3, 2001, in south-central Georgia. Referred to Armed Services Mar. 7, 2001. Committee discharged. Passed Senate Mar. 8, 2001. Received in House and held at desk Mar. 12, 2001.		

HISTORY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS—Continued			

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE RESOLUTIONS			
S. Res. 1.	—Informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled. Passed Senate Jan. 3, 2001.		
S. Res. 2.	—Informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled. Passed Senate Jan. 3, 2001.		
S. Res. 5.	—Notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a President pro tempore of the Senate. Passed Senate Jan. 3, 2001.		
S. Res. 10.	—Notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a President pro tempore of the Senate. Passed Senate Jan. 20 (Legislative day of Jan. 8), 2001.		
S. Res. 12.	—Relative to the death of Alan Cranston, former United States Senator for the State of California. Passed Senate Jan. 22, 2001.		

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
SENATE RESOLUTIONS—Continued			

**REPORTED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN REFERRED
TO COMMITTEES UNDER TIME LIMITATIONS**

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS			
	<p>H.R. 718.—To protect individuals, families, and Internet service providers from unsolicited and unwanted electronic mail. Referred to Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Judiciary Feb. 14, 2001. Reported amended from Energy and Commerce Apr. 4, 2001; Rept. 107–41, Pt. I. Referral to the Judiciary extended Apr. 4, 2001 for a period ending not later than June 5, 2001.</p> <p>H.R. 981.—To provide a biennial budget for the United States Government. Referred to the Budget and in addition to Rules, and Government Reform Mar. 13, 2001. Referral to the Budget extended Apr. 4, 2001 for a period ending not later than Sept. 5, 2001.</p> <p>H.R. 1088.—To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce fees collected by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes. Referred to Financial Services Mar. 19, 2001. Reported amended May 1, 2001; Rept. 107–52, Pt. I. Referred to Government Reform May 1, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 2, 2001. Referral extended May 2, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 8, 2001. Referral extended May 8, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 9, 2001. Referral extended May 9, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 10, 2001. Referral extended May 10, 2001 for a period ending not later than May 18, 2001.</p>		

SEC. 16

No.	Index Key and History of Bill	No.	Index Key and History of Bill
HOUSE BILLS—Continued			

BILLS IN CONFERENCE

Jefferson’s Manual, sec. XLVI (Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives, sec. 555):
“And in all cases of conference asked after a vote of disagreement, etc., the conferees of the House asking
it are to leave the papers with the conferees of the other * * *”
The House agreeing to the conference acts on the report before the House requesting a conference.

FIRST SESSION

SEC. 17
[REDACTED]

--	--

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE DAYS

MAY 2001

Tuesday, 1st
Private Calendar—Suspensions.

Wednesday, 2nd
Calendar Wednesday.

Monday, 7th
Suspensions.

Tuesday, 8th
Corrections Calendar—Suspensions.

Wednesday, 9th
Calendar Wednesday.

Monday, 14th
Discharge Calendar—District of Columbia
Business—Suspensions.

Tuesday, 15th
Private Calendar—Suspensions.

Wednesday, 16th
Calendar Wednesday.

Monday, 21st
Suspensions.

Tuesday, 22nd
Corrections Calendar—Suspensions.

Wednesday, 23rd
Calendar Wednesday.

Monday, 28th
Discharge Calendar—District of Columbia
Business—Suspensions.

Tuesday, 29th
Suspensions.

Wednesday, 30th
Calendar Wednesday.

2001						
JANUARY						
Sun	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sat
	1	2	—3	4	5	—6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	—20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	—30	—31			
FEBRUARY						
				1	2	3
4	5	—6	—7	—8	9	10
11	—12	—13	—14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	—26	—27	—28			
MARCH						
					2	3
4	—5	—6	—7	—8	9	10
11	—12	—13	—14	—15	16	17
18	—19	—20	—21	—22	23	24
25	—26	—27	—28	—29	—30	31
APRIL						
1	2	—3	—4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	—24	—25	—26	—27	28
29	30					
MAY						
6	—7	—8	—9	—10	11	12
13	—14	—15	—16	—17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		
JUNE						
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
JULY						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				
AUGUST						
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	
SEPTEMBER						
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						
OCTOBER						
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			
NOVEMBER						
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	
DECEMBER						
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

* Marked dates indicate days House in session.
Total Legislative Days 49.
Total Calendar Days 50.

** May 3 and 4 were one legislative day.

STATUS OF MAJOR BILLS—FIRST SESSION
(For more detailed information see History of Bills and Resolutions section)

Number of bill	Title	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Sent to confer- ence	Conference report agreed to in—		Date approved	Law No.
							House	Senate		
H.Con.Res. 83	LEGISLATIVE BILLS	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	
	Congressional Budget, 2002 (H. Rept. 107–26)	Mar. 23	Mar. 28	Apr. 6	Apr. 24	May 9	May 10
	APPROPRIATION BILLS									
									
									
									